### CONFIDENTIAL

189

1	STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
2	COUNTY OF RAMSEY SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3	
4	The State of Minnesota,
5	by Hubert H. Humphrey, III,
6	its attorney general,
7	and
8	Blue Cross and Blue Shield
9	of Minnesota,
10	Plaintiffs,
11	vs. File No. C1-94-8565
12	Philip Morris Incorporated, R.J.
13	Reynolds Tobacco Company, Brown
14	& Williamson Tobacco Corporation,
15	B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., Lorillard
16	Tobacco Company, The American
17	Tobacco Company, Liggett Group, Inc.,
18	The Council for Tobacco Research-U.S.A.,
19	Inc., and The Tobacco Institute, Inc.,
20	Defendants.
21	
22	DEPOSITION OF JUDITH W. OVERALL
23	Volume II, Pages 189 - 478
24	
25	
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

http://legacy.library.ucsfSedu/tid/trnp95a00/pdfidustrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/myhd0001

Τ	(The following is the continued deposition
2	of JUDITH W. OVERALL, taken pursuant to Notice of
3	Taking Deposition, at the offices of Dorsey &
4	Whitney, Attorneys at Law, Pillsbury Center South,
5	220 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota,
6	commencing at approximately 8:30 o'clock a.m.,
7	November 21, 1997.)
8	APPEARANCES:
9	On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:
10	David W. McKenna
11	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi LLP
12	Attorneys at Law
13	2800 LaSalle Plaza
14	800 LaSalle Avenue
15	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
16	On Behalf of Philip Morris Incorporated:
17	John E. Linville
18	Kalkines, Arky, Zall & Bernstein LLP
19	Attorneys at Law
20	1675 Broadway
21	New York, New York 10019-5820
22	
23	
24	
25	

### CONFIDENTIAL

191

1	Mark Ginder
2	Dorsey & Whitney LLP
3	Attorneys at Law
4	Pillsbury Center South
5	220 South Sixth Street
6	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-1498
7	
8	Jonathan R. Streeter
9	Arnold & Porter
10	Attorneys at Law
11	555 Twelfth Street N.W.
12	Washington, D.C. 20004-1206
13	On Behalf of R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company:
14	Thomas Darling
15	Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, P.A.
16	Attorneys at Law
17	3400 City Center
18	33 South Sixth Street
19	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	On Behalf of Lorillard Tobacco Company:
2	Alexandra M. Schaffer
3	Doherty, Rumble & Butler
4	Attorneys at Law
5	2800 Minnesota World Trade Center
6	30 East Seventh Street
7	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-4999
8	ALSO APPEARING:
9	Robert D. Scott
10	Whyte Hirschboeck Dudek S.C.
11	Attorneys at Law
12	111 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 2100
13	Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- 2 (Witness previously sworn.)
- 3 JUDITH W. OVERALL
- 4 called as a witness, being previously
- 5 sworn, was examined and testified
- 6 as follows:
- 7 ADVERSE EXAMINATION (cont'd)
- 8 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 9 Q. Good morning, Ms. Overall.
- 10 A. Good morning.
- 11 Q. A few more things about your CV, please.
- 12 You taught, during 1992-1993, a torts course as
- 13 an adjunct instructor in the paralegal program at
- 14 Mississippi University for Women; is that right?
- 15 A. That's -- that's correct. I'm not looking at
- 16 the year, but -- right now, but I'm --
- 17 Yes.
- 18 Q. Was that one academic year? Is that what you
- 19 mean to suggest?
- 20 A. No. I taught that one semester, I believe.
- 21 Q. Just one semester.
- 22 A. That academic year, but one semester.
- 23 Q. Did you teach anything about fraud and abuse in
- 24 the health-care delivery system in that course?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. And I take it that the work that you did at
- 2 Norton Air Force Base in 1977 to '81 was work that
- 3 you did in connection with your husband being posted
- 4 in that area?
- 5 A. It was done there geographically because he was
- 6 stationed there, yes.
- 7 Q. All right. Was there anything about that that
- 8 had anything to do with fraud and abuse in the
- 9 health-care delivery system?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. And you listed a number of seminars that you
- 12 were a speaker at. First of all, let me --
- 13 March 19th, 1993, you were a guest speaker at
- 14 the Jackson Central Lion's Club in Jackson,
- 15 Mississippi, on the subject of health-care reform and
- 16 long-term care issues?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Was any part of that discussion --
- 19 I take it that was just a luncheon speech?
- 20 A. That was a luncheon speech.
- 21 Q. Was any part of that having to do with fraud and
- 22 abuse?
- 23 A. I don't recall the complete speech. If there
- 24 was anything, it was not an integral part.
- 25 (Discussion off the record.)

- 1 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 2 Q. Did you do anything especially to prepare for
- 3 that speech, or you just spoke based upon your
- 4 training and experience at the time?
- 5 A. I don't remember what I did to prepare for that
- 6 speech.
- 7 Q. And you were the Attorney General's
- 8 representative on the advisory board of a -- of a
- 9 grant committee involving preparing state governments
- 10 for an age quake in the 21st century. How long did
- 11 that last?
- 12 A. The entire process lasted for quite a while, but
- 13 my involvement was not --
- I was only sitting on a -- a board or a
- 15 committee. I was not involved with the whole
- 16 project.
- 17 Q. And you didn't do any research in connection
- 18 with that; simply went to the meetings?
- 19 A. Right.
- 20 Q. Did any part of that have to do with fraud and
- 21 abuse in the health-care delivery system?
- 22 A. Not that I remember, no.
- 23 Q. And when you spoke to the American Society of
- 24 Women Accountants in Jackson, Mississippi, on May 7
- 25 and 8, 1993, did any part of that have to do with

- 1 fraud and abuse in the health-care delivery system?
- 2 A. If it did, and I don't remember completely, but
- 3 if it did, it would have been from a recipient point
- 4 of view because it was talking about Medicaid
- 5 eligibility rules.
- 6 Q. Would that also be true of your discussions at
- 7 the National Business Institute on the subject of
- 8 "Mississippi Elder Law: The Basics and Beyond" in
- 9 Jackson, Mississippi, on February 25, 1993, that it
- 10 had to do with recipient qualification?
- 11 A. If I remember correctly, it was more about
- 12 qualifications for Medicaid.
- 13 Q. All right. And you spoke --
- 14 A. It was about -- excuse me. It was about the
- 15 system, but I mean it was more from that point of
- 16 view, I believe.
- 17 Q. You spoke at a health-care seminar in New
- 18 Orleans on September 22, 1995, on managed care in the
- 19 '90s, and you taught a session on Medicare fraud and
- 20 abuse at that seminar?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 22 question. If you're reading the topic there, I think
- 23 you misread it.
- MR. McKENNA: What part did I misread? It
- 25 was on the subject of managed care in the '90s.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: You said "Medicare fraud and
- 2 abuse." It's "Medicare/Medicaid fraud and abuse."
- 3 MR. McKENNA: Ah. Thank you for that
- 4 correction.
- 5 Q. Do you know what I'm talking about, Ms. Overall?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. Did you lecture on that subject during that
- 8 seminar?
- 9 A. Yes, as a member of a panel.
- 10 Q. All right. How many others were on the panel?
- 11 A. Two.
- 12 Q. And so there were three of you. And did you --
- Were you given an hour during that seminar for
- 14 that subject?
- 15 A. I don't remember. We each spoke, and then there
- 16 was a question-and-answer session, so I can't --
- 17 I don't remember.
- 18 Q. All right. And you refer to some seminars for
- 19 nursing home administrators in 1992 in New Orleans,
- 20 Biloxi and Jackson. Did you run those seminars
- 21 yourself?
- 22 A. That was as a part of LTC 2000.
- 23 Q. All right. And how much in each of those did
- 24 you personally do in terms of time on the podium?
- 25 A. Probably at least half of what was taught.

- 1 Q. And what portion of those seminars was devoted
- 2 to the subject of health-care fraud and abuse,
- 3 approximately? A percentage.
- 4 A. I don't remember. It was a topic for like one
- 5 session of the seminar, as I remember, so whether --
- 6 Q. I take it the general tone of this was to assist
- 7 people in the industry to comply with industry rules
- 8 and regulations; is that true?
- 9 A. Yes. And to make them aware of rules and
- 10 regulations. It was continuing education for nursing
- 11 home administrators.
- 12 Q. And in your CV you address a number of other
- 13 issues, such as abuse and neglect and exploitation of
- 14 residents, and Americans with Disabilities Act, and
- 15 some other things; correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. So there was quite a lot to cover during those
- 18 seminars, and fraud and abuse was only a small part
- 19 of it. Is that a fair statement?
- 20 A. Fraud and abuse was only a part of it, that is a
- 21 fair statement.
- 22 Q. But you don't agree it was a small part of it.
- 23 Is that why you corrected my statement?
- 24 A. I can't remember how long the sessions were on
- 25 each topic, but it was no -- to no less a degree than

- 1 any other topics.
- 2 Q. Are you saying that it received equal treatment
- 3 with the other topics that you've listed in your CV?
- 4 A. Yes, it at least received equal.
- 5 Q. And as you said yesterday, these seminars were
- 6 one and at the most two days in length; is that
- 7 right?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. During the times that you have made
- 10 presentations to classes that you've been teaching on
- 11 the subject of fraud and abuse, have you ever brought
- 12 in guest speakers to discuss that subject?
- 13 A. Yes, I have.
- 14 Q. And is that usually your pattern, to bring in a
- 15 guest speaker to address the subject of fraud and
- 16 abuse?
- 17 A. No, it's -- it's an add-on, so to speak.
- 18 Q. Is that because you don't feel qualified to
- 19 discuss fraud and abuse in those settings?
- 20 A. No, it is not.
- 21 Q. Then why is it that you select a guest speaker
- 22 to address that topic?
- 23 A. Same reason I ask guest speakers to comment on
- 24 several topics, so they don't hear only me talk.
- 25 Q. I see. But you feel yourself equally qualified

- 1 with the guest speakers, is that a fair statement, to
- 2 talk about fraud and abuse?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. What other subjects do you bring in guest
- 5 speakers on in the courses that you teach?
- 6 A. Well managerial communications, human resource
- 7 management. I have brought in speakers who are
- 8 long-term care consultants to talk about subacute
- 9 care, how you set up subacute units. My pattern is
- 10 to bring people in who are literally in the field
- 11 now, as well as what I know, just -- just so that
- 12 they get different points of view.
- 13 Q. When the fraud and abuse subject comes up in the
- 14 courses you teach, is it usually your pattern to
- 15 bring in a guest speaker on fraud and abuse?
- 16 A. No, I don't always bring in a guest speaker. I
- 17 have.
- 18 Q. Would you say you've done it half the time when
- 19 you have addressed that subject in the courses you
- 20 taught?
- 21 A. No, I think not. I'd have to --
- 22 Q. Approximately what percentage of the time have
- 23 you deployed guest speakers on the subject of fraud
- 24 and abuse in the courses you have taught?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. As I remember, I brought in a guest speaker once
- 2 as an adjunct, full-time I think, once in the
- 3 long-term care class, and once in the EMHA class.
- 4 That's all I remember at the moment.
- 5 Q. Was that within the last year?
- 6 A. Yes, one of them.
- 7 Q. And the other one was when?
- 8 A. Hmm, I suppose it was fall of --
- 9 Well this is fall of '97, so it must have been
- 10 fall of '96.
- 11 Q. Do you use a particular text in any one of the
- 12 classes that you teach?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And what are those texts?
- 15 A. In the management course it's "Essentials of
- 16 Health Care Management, " I believe.
- 17 Q. And the authors?
- 18 A. Short --
- 19 It's written by a man named Shortell.
- 20 Q. All right.
- 21 A. In the long-term care class it's "The Essentials
- 22 of Long Term Care Administration." The author's name
- 23 is Goldsmith, I believe.
- 24 And in health law it is "Health Law," the
- 25 standard one you see. Fuhrman is the author.

- 1 Q. Fuhrman?
- 2 A. (Nodding.)
- 3 Q. Any other text that you use?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Do you use any --
- 6 A. I mean I've used different ones in the past.
- 7 Q. Tell me which ones you've used in the past on
- 8 the subject of health law.
- 9 A. That's the text I'm using.
- 10 Q. Do you use any auxiliary materials to the text?
- 11 A. Yes. Quite often I give handouts.
- 12 Q. Have you prepared any handouts on the subject of
- 13 fraud and abuse for any of your courses?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And those handouts are still in your possession?
- 16 A. They're in my possession. I mean I -- I don't
- 17 know that I still have them grouped together as a
- 18 handout, but --
- 19 Q. Can you gather them together and provide them to
- 20 counsel?
- 21 A. Yes, I will.
- 22 Q. What do those handouts consist of on the subject
- 23 of fraud and abuse?
- 24 A. Some of it is --
- I have to go back and look. I mean some of it

- 1 may be statutory. Much of it's articles about what's
- 2 happened in fraud and abuse cases, that type of
- 3 thing.
- 4 Q. But you're saying you don't have any set package
- 5 of things that you hand out?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. It differs from course to course; correct?
- 8 A. It differs from course to course, it differs
- 9 from semester to semester, because the law changes.
- 10 Q. Okay. And can you remember the names or the
- 11 subject matters of some of the articles that you've
- 12 used?
- 13 A. Not offhand.
- 14 Q. And what subjects under the broad heading of
- 15 fraud and abuse in the health-care system do these
- 16 articles address?
- 17 A. Some address fraudulent billing. Quite
- 18 frequently that -- that's one of the topics. Some, I
- 19 think, talk about the repercussions of a provider
- 20 having been charged with fraud and abuse. Some talk
- 21 about different big cases, that type of thing.
- 22 Q. These courses that you teach are intended
- 23 primarily for people who will be out working in the
- 24 industry; are they not?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 Q. And so I take it that you select articles that
- 2 provide perhaps a series of cautionary tales to
- 3 people who might be out in the industry; would that
- 4 be a fair statement?
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 A. It's fair to say that that's a part of them,
- 7 yes.
- 8 Q. How many students, approximately, in each of
- 9 these classes?
- 10 A. In the management class this semester, for
- 11 example, there are 90; in the long-term care class
- 12 there are 14 or 15; the enrollment in the health law
- 13 class is usually around 25.
- 14 Q. Is that fairly typical throughout the period of
- 15 time that you have been at Tulane teaching those
- 16 courses, that size of a class?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. We spent a good deal of time going over your
- 19 curriculum vitae. I want to ask you to tell me in
- 20 your own words, summarize for me the reasons why you
- 21 believe you are qualified to give expert testimony on
- 22 the -- expert testimony on the subject of fraud and
- 23 abuse in the Minnesota Medicaid program.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. I believe I have seen fraud and abuse, studied

- 1 fraud and abuse. I've seen fraud and abuse from a
- 2 state, in quotes, standpoint, learning how that
- 3 system worked to try to combat fraud and abuse in the
- 4 health -- in the Medicaid system in particular,
- 5 but --
- 6 Spent a lot of time working with the OIG on some
- 7 of our cases, so therefore was introduced also into
- 8 the Medicare component of it. I spent that part of
- 9 my life learning how the system works and how fraud
- 10 and abuse is combatted. And then I moved from that
- 11 side to the provider side, and so I believe that I
- 12 have a -- an idea from a provider side, too, how one
- 13 should try and comply with the rules and regulations
- 14 and what can happen to you if you do not. And I've
- 15 continued to study and to teach it.
- 16 Q. Anything you want to add to that?
- 17 A. I think not.
- 18 Q. And let me ask you the same question: Please
- 19 summarize the reasons why you feel you are qualified
- 20 to give expert testimony about the subject of fraud
- 21 and abuse in connection with Minnesota Blue Cross
- 22 Blue Shield.
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. Because I have a knowledge of types of fraud and
- 25 abuse that are common throughout the United States

- 1 and of the basic functions of units such as SURS
- 2 units, et cetera. I think I am qualified to do what
- 3 I was asked to do, which is look at this system.
- 4 Q. Anything else you want to add?
- 5 A. I think not.
- 6 Q. Do you have any idea how it was that you came to
- 7 be selected as an expert witness in this matter?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Let me just object here,
- 9 just caution that I'm sure counsel's not asking you
- 10 for any conversations you've had with -- with
- 11 counsel, the substance of any of those
- 12 conversations.
- 13 MR. McKENNA: I'm not asking for the
- 14 substance of any conversations with counsel.
- 15 A. I -- I think I was recommended.
- 16 Q. And do you know who recommended you?
- 17 A. I think Dr. Hugh Long.
- 18 Q. And who is he?
- 19 A. Dr. Long is a member of the Tulane faculty.
- 20 Q. And what subjects does he teach?
- 21 A. He teaches a lot of subjects. He's primarily a
- 22 financial -- health-care financial expert.
- 23 Q. And in what connection do you have interaction
- 24 with Dr. Long?
- 25 A. Just that we sit on the same faculty.

- 1 Q. Well are you a member of committees with him? A
- 2 social friend?
- 3 A. I have sat on a committee with him, and we are
- 4 on the same faculty.
- 5 Q. Well how many people are on the Tulane faculty?
- 6 Must be hundreds; right?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 9 A. Yes. Dr. Long is a member of our department
- 10 faculty.
- 11 Q. I see. And so Dr. Long, as a member of your
- 12 department faculty, knows about the extent of your
- 13 work in this area; is that right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And it is no more close an association than
- 16 that. I mean he's not a mentor of yours or an
- 17 advisor or anything like that?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Not your supervisor?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Who were you first contacted by in order to
- 22 begin your work on this case?
- 23 A. Are you talking about the tobacco litigation?
- 24 Q. I'm talking about this case, State of Minnesota
- 25 and Blue Cross Blue Shield versus the tobacco

- 1 industry.
- 2 A. I was contacted by Jack Linville.
- 3 Q. Okay. And when was that?
- 4 A. The best of my recollection, somewhere around
- 5 April or May of this year.
- 6 Q. And had you already been working for some time
- 7 on the Florida matter at that time?
- 8 A. I -- I --
- 9 Yes, I had done some work on Florida at that
- 10 time.
- 11 Q. Well how long had you been working on the
- 12 Florida matter at that time?
- 13 A. I can't remember when I started.
- 14 Q. Had you nearly finished your work?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And what was it that you were asked to do in
- 17 connection with this Minnesota tobacco case?
- 18 A. I was asked to look at the documents, et cetera,
- 19 that had been produced, and the Medicaid system, and
- 20 to render an opinion about what I thought about an
- 21 appropriate payment in the state of Minnesota
- 22 Medicaid program.
- 23 Q. And have you listed as a part of your report all
- 24 of the documents that you were provided?
- 25 A. I have seen a lot more documents than --

- 1 I might look. I think you'll be getting an
- 2 update, because I've seen quite a few documents in
- 3 the last two weeks. I mean just --
- 4 Q. I will be getting an update, is that what you
- 5 just said? After your deposition, you're going to
- 6 provide an update on your report?
- 7 A. I think you have been updated.
- 8 THE WITNESS: Is that not correct?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Just -- just to clear this
- 10 up, you do have, I think, at least two supplements to
- 11 this. The materials should be --
- MR. McKENNA: Well I have a supplement in
- 13 terms of a deposition of Ms. Kriha, and an affidavit
- 14 from a -- from a member of an accounting firm. Is
- 15 that the supplementation that you're talking about?
- MR. LINVILLE: That's one of them, yes.
- 17 There was an earlier supplementation as well.
- Just so the record is clear, to the extent that
- 19 documents were designated, we didn't include them in
- 20 our supplementation -- designated by the plaintiffs
- 21 in connection with the deposition, we didn't include
- 22 them, so those would be documents that she has had an
- 23 opportunity to review.
- 24 Q. Well let me ask you this then: Are you telling
- 25 me that the documents that you were provided up until

- 1 the time that you wrote your report, are all of those
- 2 listed on Appendix II-A?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And in addition to these plaintiffs' documents
- 5 and deposition testimony, you've listed in Appendix
- 6 II-B a number of public sources that you reviewed; is
- 7 that right?
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 THE REPORTER: Your answer?
- 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 11 Q. And did you review other public sources in
- 12 connection with preparing your report?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. And then since that time you've been afforded
- 15 additional materials; correct?
- 16 A. Since this time?
- 17 Q. Yes.
- 18 A. Yes. Correct.
- 19 Q. Where is your file in this matter?
- 20 A. It's at my office in Tulane.
- 21 Q. You didn't bring it with you to the deposition?
- 22 No?
- 23 A. I have some of the depositions with me.
- 24 Q. Well how did you select what you were going to
- 25 bring with you to the deposition?

- 1 A. I brought what I was given last, which I still
- 2 continue to read.
- 3 Q. Okay. So the deposition --
- 4 The original documents that you looked at with
- 5 any marginalia and notes and so forth, you've left
- 6 those in your office in Tulane; is that right?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- 8 THE REPORTER: Your answer?
- 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 10 Q. Were you told not to bring them?
- 11 A. No, I was not told not to bring them.
- 12 Q. With respect to this extensive listing of
- 13 documents which is attached to your -- to your
- 14 report, I take it that as you reviewed those you made
- 15 notes as to which parts of those were important to
- 16 you that you'd want to go back and look at?
- 17 A. I underlined and highlighted, that's correct.
- 18 Q. I see. So that if you want to go back at some
- 19 point and refresh your recollection about what you
- 20 thought was important among all of the documents
- 21 which are listed on Appendix II-A, you'd have to page
- 22 through them and look at your highlights and your
- 23 notes; is that right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. That's where my notes are, yes.

- 1 Q. Okay. Well so there isn't anyplace, for
- 2 example, where you kept a short listing of the things
- 3 that you thought were important in the deposition of
- 4 Robert Baird, for example.
- 5 A. I have made on Robert Baird's deposition like a
- 6 note, but I have noted throughout --
- 7 I mean primarily what I've noted is -- is
- 8 highlighted in those.
- 9 Q. So that the only notes that you kept about
- 10 Robert Baird's deposition are those which you wrote
- 11 on the face of it and interleaved into the pages; is
- 12 that right?
- 13 A. Which is --
- 14 Q. Marginalia?
- 15 A. Yes, that's what I've done with every
- 16 deposition.
- 17 Q. So my question is that if you wanted to go back
- 18 and look at and refresh yourself about something that
- 19 Mr. Baird said, the only place you'd be able to go is
- 20 to the deposition transcript and look at the notes
- $21\,$  you made on the front and page through it and see
- 22 what you highlighted or wrote on the pages of the
- 23 deposition; is that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. My notes in connection with Robert Baird are on

- 1 the Robert Baird -- my copy of the Robert Baird
- 2 transcript.
- 3 Q. And no place else.
- 4 A. As I recall. I mean that -- that's been my
- 5 pattern through all of this, is --
- 6 Q. That's my next question. That's true with all
- 7 of these documents. The only place where you kept
- 8 any notes is on the document themselves; is that
- 9 right?
- 10 A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. Yes?
- 12 A. Yes, that's where all --
- 13 Yes.
- 14 Q. And I note, for example, on page 18 of your
- 15 report, you state that Mr. Baird agrees with your
- 16 assessment on that particular subject in his
- 17 deposition testimony. Did you do not -- did you not
- 18 do that?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. So if I ask you today where in Mr. Baird's
- 21 deposition does he state his agreement with you, you
- 22 wouldn't be able to tell me because you don't have
- 23 his deposition with you; right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 Q. During the time that you were preparing yourself
- 2 for your work in this case, did you ever talk to
- 3 anybody in Minnesota about the Medicaid system?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Did you ever talk to anybody in Minnesota about
- 6 Blue Cross Blue Shield in Minnesota?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Did you ever talk to anybody, aside from
- 9 counsel, with respect to the subject matter of your
- 10 testimony?
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form. Do you mean
- 12 in Minnesota, or do you mean anybody anywhere?
- MR. McKENNA: No, I mean anybody.
- MR. LINVILLE: Okay.
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. How much time did you spend studying the matter
- 17 before you rendered a preliminary opinion or report
- 18 to counsel?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. I don't remember specifically. Probably about
- 21 three or four full days.
- 22 Q. All right. And then did you have verbal
- 23 conversations, or did you send a preliminary written
- 24 report?
- 25 A. Verbal conversation.

- 1 Q. And that verbal conversation, what -- what next
- 2 step did that lead to? Without telling me what was
- 3 in the conversation, what did you do next?
- 4 A. I had the opinion typed.
- 5 Q. Well were those conversations on the telephone,
- 6 or did you go to New York, or did somebody come to
- 7 visit you?
- 8 A. I went to New York.
- 9 Q. Okay. And how long were those conferences?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. They varied. They were --
- 12 The conferences were basically quite short,
- 13 actually.
- 14 Q. And how long were you in New York in connection
- 15 with that first go-around?
- 16 A. Three or four days.
- 17 Q. Yeah. But the conferences were short, a short
- 18 period of time each day?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And after that, then you went back to New
- 21 Orleans and prepared a written version of your
- 22 report?
- 23 A. No. I dictated the written version of my report
- 24 in New York.
- 25 Q. I see. And then the typing was done by your

- 1 staff in the office of the attorneys?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. So that if I asked you the meaning of the
- 4 computer numbers in the lower left-hand corner of
- 5 each page of your report, those would be something
- 6 interior to the lawyers' office and not something
- 7 you'd be able to explain to me; is that true?
- 8 A. That's true.
- 9 Q. So that after this report was typed the first
- 10 time around --
- 11 Were you still in New York at that time? Did
- 12 you review a draft of it before you left New York?
- 13 A. It was complete before I left New York.
- 14 Q. Okay. Was there more than one draft?
- 15 A. There was a -- there was --
- 16 There were typographical corrections made. It
- 17 was not a -- there was no change in the substance of
- 18 the draft.
- 19 Q. So are you saying, then, that the -- that you
- 20 dictated this with a -- with a dictaphone or cassette
- 21 recorder of some kind?
- 22 A. No. I basically discussed here are -- here's
- 23 what I'm saying.
- 24 Q. And then someone else dictated the actual text
- 25 of this; is that what you're saying?

- 1 A. No. They wrote down what I said.
- 2 Q. And who is "they?" A stenographer? Or was it
- 3 one of the attorneys?
- 4 A. I don't know the capacity of one of them. I
- 5 don't remember.
- 6 Q. Well let me see if I can't come at this a
- 7 different direction.
- 8 In the course of meetings with the lawyers,
- 9 there may have been one or two people there whose
- 10 capacity you didn't understand, but most of the
- 11 people in the meeting were you and the lawyers; is
- 12 that true?
- 13 A. That's --
- 14 Yes.
- 15 Q. And in that --
- In those conferences, you would state what your
- 17 opinion was, and somebody would write that down.
- 18 A. Right.
- 19 Q. And then later that would be presented to you in
- 20 a typewritten form; correct?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. And all you did with respect to that typewritten
- 23 form was to go through and correct typographical
- 24 errors; is that so?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 Counsel, just so we're clear here, I think the
- 2 ground rules are that we're not supposed to inquire
- 3 on the substance of prior drafts. I just want to
- 4 make sure the witness and you understand that in
- 5 terms of --
- 6 MR. McKENNA: Well she's the one who said
- 7 there were typographical errors.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: That's why I want to make
- 9 sure everybody understands the ground rules here.
- 10 A. If there had been something in here that I did
- 11 not say, I would have made a change, but there was
- 12 not.
- 13 Q. However, what you have said to me, if I
- 14 understand it correctly, is that you did not dictate
- 15 this verbatim, that you spoke about what your point
- 16 of view was on this and that that was somehow
- 17 translated into writing; is that right?
- 18 A. It basically says exactly what I said.
- 19 Q. No. Please try to pay attention to my question.
- 20 You did not dictate this verbatim, but you
- 21 expressed your point of view on these subjects and it
- 22 was somehow translated into writing for you; is that
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. So then after --

- 1 When was this conference in New York, this
- 2 several-day conference?
- 3 A. Early June, I believe.
- 4 Q. And at that time were you also given an
- 5 opportunity to look at the reports of the plaintiffs'
- 6 experts?
- 7 A. No. I saw -- I --
- 8 I've seen one.
- 9 Q. What did --
- 10 What is it that you saw, do you recall?
- 11 A. I saw the --
- 12 The only one I recall seeing is the damage --
- 13 the here's what we're claiming in damages. I don't
- 14 remember what it's called, but it's the one to do
- 15 with damages.
- 16 Q. In your report on page three, at the very last
- 17 line, please follow along with me and tell me whether
- 18 I understand correctly what's in your report. "In
- 19 reviewing what I understand is the report of the
- 20 plaintiffs' principal damage experts, I found no
- 21 mention of the possibility that fraud and abuse may
- 22 have inflated inappropriately the health care
- 23 expenditures that form the basis of plaintiffs'
- 24 damage calculations." Did I read that correctly?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And what you're telling me is that the report
- 2 that you saw was the one from the Johns Hopkins folks
- 3 with respect to the dollar amount of damages in the
- 4 case?
- 5 A. The one I saw was the one that describes a model
- 6 of how to calculate damages.
- 7 Q. But you only saw one report of experts; is that
- 8 true?
- 9 A. That's -- that's true.
- 10 Q. Have you been made aware that the plaintiffs
- 11 have retained experts on a broad variety of subjects,
- 12 more than just the economic model with respect to
- 13 damages?
- 14 A. Am I aware of it?
- 15 Q. Yes.
- 16 A. I don't know that it's anything that's ever even
- 17 been discussed with me.
- 18 Q. Okay. While you were in New York, did you do
- 19 any further review of documents, aside from looking
- 20 at this expert report?
- 21 A. What expert --
- The plaintiffs' expert report?
- 23 Q. Yes.
- 24 A. Yes, I did an enormous amount of reviewing of
- 25 documents.

- 1 Q. In counsel's office.
- 2 A. Yes. Well, in counsel's office and in my hotel
- 3 room.
- 4 Q. Did you bring with you documents from New
- 5 Orleans to review?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. So the things that you reviewed in your hotel
- 8 room were things that they sent home with you from
- 9 counsel's office?
- 10 A. There were things I requested to take and read.
- 11 Q. My question is: The things that you took to
- 12 your hotel room to review are things you took with
- 13 you from counsel's office; correct?
- 14 A. Yes. That's where all the documents were.
- 15 Q. Well you didn't go to the library or something
- 16 like that, you -- you didn't bring anything with you,
- 17 and what you read in your room you got from the
- 18 lawyers. Is that true?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. Okay. Approximately how much time did you spend
- 21 studying additional documents and materials while you
- 22 were in New York?
- 23 A. Almost the entire time I was in New York I was
- 24 reading.
- 25 Q. All right. Now, however, at the time that you

- 1 went to New York, you had already come to some
- 2 conclusions about the matter; is that true?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. No. At the time I arrived in New York I was not
- 5 ready to say one way or another what I thought.
- 6 Q. I see. And were some of the things that you
- 7 took to your hotel room to read things that counsel
- 8 suggested that you read?
- 9 A. What counsel did was provide for me basically
- 10 everything that had been produced in front of me on a
- 11 big table and said, "Here they are," and I spent
- 12 three or four days reading this stuff.
- 13 Q. Now you know that I'm talking about New York
- 14 now; don't you?
- 15 A. What?
- 16 Q. You know that I'm talking about your visit to
- 17 New York.
- 18 A. And that's what I'm describing to you.
- 19 Q. You didn't read that stuff during the three or
- 20 four days that you devoted to the subject back in
- 21 Louisiana?
- 22 A. I never said I had devoted three or four days
- 23 back in Louisiana.
- 24 Q. All right. Let me back up.
- 25 How much time did you spend in Louisiana

- 1 discussing this? I understood you to tell me you
- 2 spent three or four days on it.
- 3 A. No. I'm sorry, that -- if that's what I --
- 4 I didn't mean to convey that.
- 5 Q. All right. When you were asked to look at this
- 6 matter, did you do any work on the subject in terms
- 7 of research before rendering any preliminary opinions
- 8 to counsel while you were still in Louisiana?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 10 A. Not specific to Minnesota. I reviewed some of
- 11 my own materials on fraud and abuse, but the only --
- 12 I mean I waited until I had read all of the
- 13 Minnesota documents before I could say anything.
- 14 There was no way not to do that.
- 15 Q. Okay. Well had you been provided while you were
- 16 still in Louisiana with all the Minnesota documents?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Okay. Did you see any of them before you went
- 19 to New York?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. What?
- 22 A. I had seen the plaintiffs' experts' damage
- 23 opinion, basically, and possibly the Minnesota
- 24 statute, I don't remember for sure, and perhaps a
- 25 document that describes the Minnesota welfare

- 1 programs. I'm not sure that was the document, but --
- 2 that's what I remember at the moment.
- 3 Q. So you believe that you've told me now all of
- 4 the things that you had pertaining to the Minnesota
- 5 case before you went to New York; correct?
- 6 A. All that I --
- 7 All that I had or all that I had read?
- 8 Q. Well how did you read something you didn't have?
- 9 A. I couldn't read something I didn't have.
- 10 Q. Right.
- 11 A. But I believe I had a few more documents than I
- 12 have just described to you, but I did not have time
- 13 to read them before I got to New York.
- 14 Q. I see. What were the additional documents --
- 15 A. But I --
- 16 Q. -- that you didn't have time to read?
- 17 A. I can't remember them. I'm not -- it's not --
- 18 Q. All right. At any rate, the documents that you
- 19 had reviewed, whether or not you had them before you
- 20 went to New York, you've described to me; correct?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. The best I remember at the moment.
- 23 Q. When you say "the Minnesota statute," do you
- 24 mean the Minnesota Medicaid statutes?
- 25 A. I mean the -- the statutes that describe the

- 1 Minnesota Medicaid program.
- 2 Q. All right. Did you have the complaint in the
- 3 matter?
- 4 A. Yes, I did have the complaint.
- 5 Q. Had you read that before you went to New York?
- 6 A. Yes, I had.
- 7 Q. And when you got to New York, one of the things
- 8 that you were met with was a table full of materials
- 9 that you read at attorneys' offices and back in your
- 10 hotel room; correct?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. Did you take any materials with you when you
- 13 went to New York?
- 14 A. Yes. I took whatever I already had.
- 15 Q. Okay. Did you take any public sources with you
- 16 when you went to New York?
- 17 A. I can't remember whether I carried any of the
- 18 congressional hearings and stuff, I -- I don't
- 19 remember whether I actually carried them with me or
- 20 not.
- 21 Q. Once you read these documents in Minnesota -- in
- 22 New York during that three- or four-day period, did
- 23 you then take them back with you to Louisiana on your
- 24 way back?
- 25 A. I -- I took back with me whatever I carried,

- 1 yes. I specifically don't remember what all I took
- 2 with me.
- 3 Q. Well did you --
- 4 Did you ever get all of these documents in
- 5 Louisiana?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay. And you didn't take them back with you.
- 8 Some of them were shipped with you; is that what
- 9 you're saying?
- 10 A. Yes. If I didn't take them back, they would
- 11 still be there.
- 12 Q. Have you ever looked at them since the time you
- 13 reviewed them in New York?
- 14 A. Some of them.
- 15 Q. Do you remember which ones you looked at since
- 16 the time you looked at them in New York?
- 17 A. No, because I had been produced --
- 18 I've had volumes produced to me in the --
- 19 consistently, and I've been continuing to read even
- 20 new stuff.
- 21 Q. Was Exhibit -- Appendix II-B to your report also
- 22 prepared while you were in New York? I note that it
- 23 bears the same --
- 24 A. Yes, it was.
- 25 Q. Okay. Do you have a recollection of looking at

- 1 any of those while you were in New York?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Which ones?
- 4 A. I looked at everything that's on the page.
- 5 Q. While you were in New York?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Do you believe that you also looked at all of
- 8 the documents which are in Appendix II-A, the
- 9 Minnesota documents, while you were in New York?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.
- 11 Q. Did you read them all?
- 12 A. I read them all. Now did I read them --
- I mean I read them all, yes.
- 14 Q. Yes. And was that the time that you made the
- 15 notations in the margins and underlined and on the
- 16 cover of the documents as you described, while you
- 17 were in New York?
- 18 A. I don't remember if I did it or not. They're on
- 19 my copies that I now have in my office, but I --
- 20 Q. Did you at any time have a research assistant in
- 21 connection with the preparation for your testimony
- 22 here?
- 23 A. No.
- 24 Q. Did you do any research yourself, utilizing a
- 25 computer, for example?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Did you do any research outside of the materials
- 3 that were in your own office and those materials
- 4 which were provided by counsel to you?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. After the session that you had in New York, when
- 7 was the next time you spent some time on this case?
- 8 A. In September, I believe.
- 9 Q. And what did you --
- 10 (Discussion off the record.)
- 11 Q. And what did you do then?
- 12 A. I read more documents. I met with counsel.
- 13 Q. And at that time were you preparing for the
- 14 deposition?
- 15 A. I wasn't asked to prepare for the deposition,
- 16 no. I was just still trying to read documents.
- 17 Q. Were these documents new documents to you that
- 18 you were reading?
- 19 A. I received new documents several times, seems
- 20 like every day. Consistently receiving new
- 21 documents. So the -- the best that I remember, what
- 22 I was looking at was new documents --
- I don't remember.
- 24 Q. Were they depositions, the new documents that
- 25 you were given?
  - STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
    P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. I have received -- I have received depositions
- 2 as new documents, yes, as they've been finished, up
- 3 until even last week.
- 4 Q. Were they depositions, the new documents that
- 5 you were receiving?
- 6 A. Some of them were depositions.
- 7 Q. Okay. What other documents aside from
- 8 depositions were they?
- 9 A. I -- I believe primarily they are depositions.
- 10 I have to --
- 11 Q. Were they primarily depositions of
- 12 representatives of the Department of Human Services
- 13 and Blue Cross Blue Shield that were taken over the
- 14 course of this last summer and fall?
- 15 A. I have those depositions, yes. And I did not
- 16 get them all at the same time.
- 17 Q. I'm trying to get a handle on primarily what
- 18 this stuff was, and I ask you: Were they primarily
- 19 depositions of DHS and Blue Cross Blue Shield folks
- 20 taken over this summer and fall? Now if they were
- 21 not primarily that, then tell me what they were.
- 22 A. Well I have received copies of depositions,
- 23 that's correct; I have exhibits, boxes I think; I
- 24 have received things like this affidavit that just
- 25 came out. That was late, even up to last week I was

- 1 still receiving things, so it's -- it's a combination
- 2 of.
- 3 Q. Has anything that you've received over the
- 4 course of the time since you prepared this report
- 5 changed your opinion with respect to this matter?
- 6 A. No, it has not.
- 7 Q. Is there a place where you have a listing of the
- 8 documents that you've reviewed?
- 9 A. Everything that I have reviewed has been sent to
- 10 you in an update.
- 11 Q. Would you like me to repeat my question?
- 12 A. No.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 Q. Well I'll -- I'll ask it again. Is there a
- 15 place where you have kept a listing of the documents
- 16 that you have reviewed?
- 17 A. That I myself wrote in my own hand?
- 18 Q. I don't care whose hand it is. Is there a place
- 19 in which you have kept a listing of the documents
- 20 that you have reviewed?
- 21 A. There is a record of every document I have
- 22 reviewed.
- 23 Q. And what is the form of that record?
- 24 A. Handwritten as they were given to me, and then
- 25 translated into a list to send to you.

- 1 Q. Well the list to send to me, are you referring
- 2 to Exhibit II-A to your deposition --
- 3 A. I'm referring --
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: And to the supplemental.
- 5 Q. -- and to your report?
- 6 A. I'm referring to that and the supplement.
- 7 Q. And that's the only place that you made any
- 8 list --
- 9 A. Uh-huh.
- 10 Q. -- of what you reviewed?
- 11 THE REPORTER: Your answer?
- 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm sorry.
- 13 Q. Where did you stay when you were in New York, by
- 14 the way?
- 15 A. Sheraton, I think.
- 16 Q. During these meetings that you held in New York,
- 17 were there any lawyers from Minnesota there?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Have there been other meetings in New York about
- 20 this case?
- 21 A. Not that I've seen.
- 22 Q. The meetings that you attended further were
- 23 conducted in Louisiana; is that right?
- 24 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 25 Q. And how many such meetings were there and when

- 1 did they take place?
- 2 A. One in September -- one or two in September, I
- 3 can't remember which, and in -- this is
- 4 November. This month.
- 5 Q. All right. The meetings in September, how long
- 6 did they last?
- 7 A. They varied. I mean they were mostly "Here are
- 8 more documents." They were not lengthy.
- 9 Q. Someone came to Louisiana to deliver you more
- 10 documents; is that what you're saying?
- 11 A. Yes. And then there were discussions in --
- 12 There were some discussions, but the discussions
- 13 were not the -- the --
- 14 It's not like there was a three-day meeting and
- 15 nothing like discussions or anything like that.
- 16 Q. Well how long were the meetings? Can you not
- 17 tell me that?
- 18 A. They would vary in length because I was -- these
- 19 had to take place in between my teaching schedule, so
- 20 it wasn't like there was ever any lengthy period of
- 21 time. Probably an hour or two, and perhaps some days
- 22 that I didn't teach it would be longer than that, but
- 23 it was -- it was --
- I was jostling my time as it was, so -- so there
- 25 would be a meeting for perhaps an hour or two hours

- 1 and I would go back to work.
- 2 Q. Okay. Were there two separate times that you
- 3 met in September?
- 4 A. I believe that's correct. I'd have to go back
- 5 and look at my calendar.
- 6 Q. And on each of those occasions, was counsel in
- 7 New Orleans for more than one day to meet with you?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. How many days?
- 10 A. Two or three I would say.
- 11 Q. And are you saying that there were only a couple
- 12 of hours in each of those days that they met with
- 13 you?
- 14 A. They varied. Much of the time spent while
- 15 counsel was there I was not with counsel, I was
- 16 taking documents and reading them, even at home with
- 17 me at night, but not meeting with counsel doing that.
- 18 Q. Are you able to estimate for me how many hours
- 19 during those two visits you met with counsel?
- 20 A. I can't remember how many days counsel was
- 21 there. I cannot remember how many days counsel was
- 22 there, and so I don't know what to --
- 23 Less than 40 hours, I mean I can start from
- 24 there, but I don't know -- I mean it has -- has to be
- 25 less than that, but I -- I don't know how to

- 1 answer --
- 2 I don't remember how many days counsel was
- 3 there.
- 4 Q. Well does the number of days -- do you need to
- 5 know that in order to estimate how many hours you met
- 6 with them?
- 7 A. Yes, because that's how I'm calculating. I'm
- 8 trying to remember how many days.
- 9 Q. All right.
- 10 A. You know, days --
- 11 Q. All right. So you cannot be any more --
- 12 Are you saying somewhere between zero and 40
- 13 hours you met with counsel, or are you saying
- 14 approximately 40 hours?
- 15 A. I'm saying that it could possibly have been as
- 16 much as 40 hours at the maximum. No, it wasn't zero,
- 17 but I -- the only -- you've asked --
- I can't give you a true number, I don't know,
- 19 and the only thing I can do is approximate.
- 20 Q. I've asked you for an approximation.
- 21 A. And that's best I can give you.
- 22 Q. All right. Are you saying close to 40 hours
- 23 then?
- 24 A. I'm saying I believe that's the maximum it could
- 25 have been.

- 1 Q. Well I think you can understand that when you
- 2 say "maximum," I'm entitled to know something about
- 3 what you consider to be the minimum. What do you
- 4 consider to be the minimum if 40 is the maximum?
- 5 A. Twenty.
- 6 Q. Okay. So the closest you are able to estimate,
- 7 based upon an experience that you had in September of
- 8 this year, is 20 to 40 hours, in that range; is that
- 9 what you're saying?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, we're -- we're at
- 12 about an hour here, so when you come to a logical --
- MR. McKENNA: Yes, let's take a short
- 14 break, please.
- 15 (Recess taken.)
- 16 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 17 Q. So we've now discussed the conferences that you
- 18 had with counsel in September in Louisiana.
- 19 Thereafter, what was the next thing that you did on
- 20 this case? Was that the meetings in November?
- 21 A. Let's see. Well I read documents, but --
- Yes. Basically, yes.
- 23 Q. And as documents came in -- as you said, seemed
- 24 like daily -- you would try to review them when your
- 25 circumstances permitted; correct?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Right along, instead of waiting for the November
- 3 meeting.
- 4 A. No. Basically between those two meetings,
- 5 during that period of time I had Russians.
- 6 Q. I see. So folks visiting here as a part of this
- 7 program that you talked about?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. So your time was limited that you could
- 10 devote to this until the November meetings; correct?
- 11 A. Correct, because I --
- 12 Correct.
- 13 Q. And where did the November meetings take place?
- 14 Also in Louisiana, in New Orleans?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And for how many days?
- 17 A. Basically about three days in one week and two
- 18 days -- maybe an hour in a third day of the second
- 19 week. But now that --
- You have to take into consideration that's in
- 21 between my teaching and committee meetings and all
- 22 this kind of stuff, so it's not -- I mean it's not a
- 23 day or a day; parts of days.
- 24 Q. And was one of those periods of time this week?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. If you take the first meeting in November,
- 2 approximately how many hours did you spend with
- 3 counsel at that time?
- 4 A. Oh, gee. I can only give you an estimate: it's
- 5 less than 20.
- 6 Q. All right. And once again, as you know from our
- 7 prior interchange, I'm going to ask you to focus more
- 8 than that. You're not saying --
- 9 Are you saying close to 20 or close to zero,
- 10 recognizing, of course, that it's not zero?
- 11 A. Closer to 20 than to zero.
- 12 Q. All right.
- 13 A. I can't give you --
- 14 Q. All right. Then this week in preparation for
- 15 your testimony here the last couple of days,
- 16 attorneys came down to Louisiana to help you prepare
- 17 for this experience; is that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 A. Attorneys came to Louisiana, that's correct.
- 20 Q. Now are you omitting the latter part of my
- 21 question because you don't agree that they came to
- 22 help you prepare for your testimony?
- 23 A. I omitted it because it's not the sole reason
- 24 they came. It was to continue with everything else.
- 25 Q. It was to continue to prepare you with respect

- 1 to what had transpired in the case and to prepare you
- 2 for the deposition; is that true?
- 3 A. As they continued to prepare for trial, yes.
- 4 Q. Have there been any other times when you've met
- 5 with counsel with respect to this case?
- 6 A. No. I spoke with counsel in October, but that's
- 7 when I got sick, and I did not meet with counsel nor
- 8 even discuss anything about the case.
- 9 Q. Since the time that you prepared the report,
- 10 which is before you as Exhibit 4848, have you
- 11 consulted other public sources aside from those
- 12 listed in Appendix II-B to your report?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. And since that time have you consulted with
- 15 anyone --
- MR. LINVILLE: Were you finished?
- 17 MR. McKENNA: Have you got something to add
- 18 to your answer?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Were you finished with your
- 20 answer?
- 21 THE WITNESS: No.
- 22 A. I have read in preparation for class, but not in
- 23 any -- thinking about this. I mean --
- 24 Q. All right. Then have you talked to anybody in
- 25 Minnesota, aside from counsel, with respect to this

- 1 matter?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. So is it fair to say that except for lawyers and
- 4 reviewing depositions and documents that have been
- 5 produced here, you have not done any -- made any
- 6 contact with anybody in Minnesota with respect to the
- 7 subject matter of your testimony?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. You also --
- 10 You still have in front of you the copy of the
- 11 order, which is Exhibit 4846, and I direct your
- 12 attention back to page seven.
- 13 Have you provided to counsel --
- 14 A. You mean this?
- 15 Q. I'm sorry, I misspoke. It's 4847, not 4846.
- 16 Page seven of it.
- 17 A. Okay.
- 18 Q. Have you --
- 19 Have we discussed here all of the times when you
- 20 have given testimony by deposition at legislative or
- 21 administrative hearings or at trial? You told us
- 22 about one deposition in connection with the
- 23 Tishomingo nursing home; right? Anything else?
- 24 A. Where I testified myself?
- 25 Q. Yes. Yes.

- 1 A. Well other than the divorce proceeding.
- 2 Q. Your own?
- 3 A. My own.
- 4 Q. All right. Anything else?
- 5 A. I don't remember any other testimony.
- 6 Q. And you notice that paragraph e) requires "a
- 7 listing of all principal treatises, articles, or
- 8 documents relied upon by the expert in support of his
- 9 or her opinion." And those treatises and articles or
- 10 documents are the documents generated in this case
- 11 and the public sources that you cite in your report;
- 12 is that true?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And paragraph f) requires "all notes,
- 15 handwritings, calculations or other documents of any
- 16 kind or nature existing at the time of the service of
- 17 the expert's signed report prepared in whole or in
- 18 part for this matter by the expert or by others at
- 19 his request."
- Is it true that there are no such things except
- 21 for your handwritten notes upon the depositions and
- 22 documents that you reviewed while you were in New
- 23 York?
- 24 A. That's true.
- 25 Q. But you have not produced those; is that true?

- 1 A. No, I have not.
- 2 Q. But it is true that some, at least, of those
- 3 documents do contain your handwritten notes and
- 4 marginalia made prior to preparing your report; is
- 5 that right?
- 6 A. I cannot remember if I made notations on those
- 7 in New York or after I got back and reread them, but
- 8 all the notes I have made are on those documents.
- 9 Q. Has counsel ever asked you to provide to him all
- 10 notes, handwritings, calculations or other documents
- 11 of any kind or nature existing at the time of the
- 12 service of your report, all of the things that are
- 13 listed in paragraph f) -- or subparagraph f) of
- 14 paragraph A.1. of this order?
- 15 A. I remember counsel saying in New York -- asking
- 16 me if I had any handwritten notes, like set of notes,
- 17 and I said no because I didn't. And that's what I
- 18 assumed he was talking about, and so I didn't give
- 19 him anything because I didn't have any.
- 20 Q. Tell me what kind of marginalia or notes that
- 21 you would make. Would you make --
- In a deposition, for example, would you make a
- 23 note on the cover of the deposition, a page number of
- 24 something you thought was significant?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. What I have done systematically is highlight.
- 2 If there is something that I particularly want to go
- 3 back to, I have starred with a pen. In some
- 4 instances I have circled words. Sometimes I have
- 5 written like a note in the margin of two or three
- 6 words, I mean not anything of any length, but --
- 7 That's what I've done.
- 8 Q. And that would be in the text of the document or
- 9 deposition; correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And again, as we discussed a while ago, if you
- 12 wanted to refresh yourself as to what you thought was
- 13 important about a particular deposition, it would be
- 14 necessary for you to page through it looking for your
- 15 underlines, stars, or marginal notations; is that
- 16 right?
- 17 A. (Nodding.)
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 MR. McKENNA: I think --
- 20 Did you get the answer?
- 21 THE REPORTER: I didn't.
- 22 Q. What is your answer? Is it yes?
- 23 A. The answer is yes.
- 24 Q. And have you prepared a supplemental opinion in
- 25 the matter?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. And are you expecting to do so?
- 3 A. When I finish completely, when I feel that --
- 4 that I have had all the time I want to study all the
- 5 documents, if I feel that I need to supplement the
- 6 opinion then, I will.
- 7 Q. At the present time you haven't been asked to;
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. No, I have not been asked to.
- 10 Q. And at the present time you don't have an
- 11 intention to do it; is that right?
- 12 A. At the present time I'm still not --
- I need more time to thoroughly go through all
- 14 these documents. I have seen nothing yet that would
- 15 at this moment cause me to change my opinion.
- 16 Q. Aside from your consultation in the Florida
- 17 tobacco case, have there been any other occasions
- 18 when you have consulted as an expert witness in
- 19 litigation of any kind?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. And I
- 22 think the testimony was Florida was not as an expert
- 23 witness.
- MR. McKENNA: Beg your pardon?
- 25 MR. LINVILLE: I think the testimony was

- 1 that Florida was not as an expert witness. I think
- 2 you misspoke in the question.
- 3 Q. Well your testimony or your work in the Florida
- 4 case was not as a fact witness; was it?
- 5 A. You mean was I called to testify about facts?
- 6 Q. No. No. Your work in the Florida case was
- 7 preparation for possibly giving expert testimony in
- 8 that case; is that true?
- 9 A. Initially, but that's not -- it didn't continue
- 10 that that was the case.
- 11 Q. Right. The case was disposed of, or you were
- 12 for some reason -- other reason asked not to
- 13 continue; is that right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. He
- 15 doesn't want to know what counsel told you or asked
- 16 you.
- 17 Q. I don't want to know what counsel told you or
- 18 asked you, but you seem to be implying that you were
- 19 not working in the Florida case as an expert
- 20 consultant. Is that true?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: My only -- my only question
- 22 and clarification was the testifying expert. I think
- 23 she -- she --
- 24 MR. McKENNA: I think it's clear she didn't
- 25 testify.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Yes.
- 2 MR. McKENNA: She made that clear.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Okay. That was my --
- 4 Q. But the purpose of your consultation was
- 5 preparation for possibly giving expert testimony and
- 6 for no other reason; true?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. Well initially, that's correct.
- 9 Q. Well what did it become that wasn't that?
- 10 A. I'm not sure how to answer that.
- 11 Q. Well are you implying that it did become
- 12 something other than that?
- 13 A. I don't know, because I never thought about
- 14 these terms. I was notified that I would not
- 15 testify. I continued to do some work, but not to be
- 16 a testifying -- not to be -- I don't know how to
- 17 answer this. This is what happened, so --
- 18 Q. Well are you suggesting that you became a part
- 19 of counsel's team?
- 20 A. No. No.
- 21 Q. Your consultation with them was because of your
- 22 experience and background with respect to health-law
- 23 issues?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. And were you --

- 1 All of the work was done, as in this case, with
- 2 a view towards studying the existence of fraud in the
- 3 Medicaid program in Florida.
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. And you understood that the objective for your
- 6 study was to determine ultimately whether or not you
- 7 would be a witness in that case; correct?
- 8 A. The purpose of my study was to determine whether
- 9 I would ultimately be a witness?
- 10 Q. I'm not sure why you're playing cat and mouse
- 11 with this.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. I
- 13 object to that comment, counsel.
- 14 A. I don't understand your last question.
- 15 Q. All right. You have implied that there was
- 16 something other about your consultation in Florida
- 17 than preparation to give expert testimony, and I want
- 18 to know what that was, if there was anything else.
- 19 If there was nothing else, just say so and we'll move
- 20 on.
- 21 A. And I'm telling you I don't know what to -- how
- 22 to categorize it. I knew that I was not going to
- 23 testify as an expert witness, but --
- 24 I still looked at the system --
- 25 Q. And you still --

- 1 A. -- after I knew I was not going to testify.
- 2 Q. And you still worked for them, studied the
- 3 matter for them and billed them for the work you
- 4 did.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And gave them advice.
- 7 A. I gave them -- I guess you would call it
- 8 advice. Gave them an analysis.
- 9 Q. And "them" is the defense of the tobacco
- 10 industry in the Florida litigation.
- 11 A. "Them" is --
- "Them" is the attorneys who retained me to do
- 13 it, yes.
- 14 Q. And those attorneys were representing the
- 15 tobacco industry.
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. In the course of your work in this, or for that
- 18 matter in the Florida case, did you have contacts
- 19 with other persons who were providing expert
- 20 consultation to the defense?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. Do you personally smoke cigarettes?
- 23 A. Upon a rare occasion.
- 24 Q. And has it ever been something that's more than
- 25 a matter of a rare occasion?

- 1 A. Yes. I used to smoke.
- 2 Q. When you speak about currently being a person
- 3 who smokes on rare occasions, approximately how often
- 4 does that happen to you?
- 5 A. Oh, quite infrequently, but --
- 6 I mean quite infrequently. Occasionally I
- 7 feel --
- 8 Q. How long ago was it that you quit, except for
- 9 this highly occasional use?
- 10 A. Gee. Approximately nineteen eighty --
- 11 Somewhere around 1983, somewhere thereabouts.
- 12 Q. And did you do that, that is to say, stop
- 13 smoking, except for this highly occasional use, out
- 14 of concern that smoking was hazardous to your health?
- 15 A. I quit smoking because my divorce was over with
- 16 and I was no longer under that -- the stress I was
- 17 under when I was smoking.
- 18 Q. So it wasn't out of a concern for your health;
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Basically I told you why.
- 21 Q. Do you believe that cigarette smoking is
- 22 hazardous to your health?
- 23 A. Yes, I do.
- 24 Q. And what particular aspects of one's health do
- 25 you believe can be adversely impacted by smoking?

- 1 A. I suppose your lungs and cardiovascular system.
- 2 Q. Do you understand that cigarette smoking has
- 3 been linked causally to the incidence -- high
- 4 incidence of lung cancer in this country?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And same with respect to heart disease?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Stroke?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And respiratory difficulties?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And you believe that those things are true.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Have you ever had occasion to look into the
- 15 matter any further to form an opinion as to the
- 16 likelihood that a smoker will suffer one or more of
- 17 those diseases?
- 18 A. Not that I -- not that I recall specifically,
- 19 no. I mean --
- 20 Q. Do you believe that nicotine is addictive?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Notwithstanding your own belief that cigarette
- 23 smoking is hazardous to your health, do you
- 24 understand that there has been a debate in the public
- 25 in which the tobacco industry and others contend that

- 1 there is no proof that smoking is hazardous to your
- 2 health?
- 3 A. Yes, I understand that there's been that debate.
- 4 Q. Do you think it's reasonable for a citizen in
- 5 Minnesota to believe that it's uncertain as to
- 6 whether a scientific causal link has been drawn
- 7 between smoking and certain diseases?
- 8 A. I don't think I can speak for a citizen of
- 9 Minnesota.
- 10 Q. Is there something about citizens of Minnesota
- 11 that would be different from citizens elsewhere in
- 12 your mind in that respect?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Do you believe that it would be reasonable for a
- 15 person who is familiar with this public debate that
- 16 we've alluded to to believe that it's uncertain as to
- 17 whether a scientific causal link has been drawn
- 18 between smoking and certain diseases?
- 19 A. I -- I think each individual has to draw his own
- 20 conclusion.
- 21 Q. I understand that. I'm just asking you whether
- 22 you think it's reasonable for a person to, because of
- 23 this debate, to believe that it's uncertain as to
- 24 whether this causal link has been drawn between
- 25 smoking and certain diseases.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. And I repeat, I think each individual has to
- 3 make that determination.
- 4 Q. And have to make that determination based upon
- 5 the public debate about the issue; true?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. I don't know how many people are even aware of
- 8 the facts that are going on in the public debate.
- 9 Q. All right. But those who are aware of them have
- 10 to make a decision based upon the contention of the
- 11 tobacco industry and others that it's uncertain that
- 12 this causal link exists on the one hand, and the
- 13 Surgeon General and others on the other hand
- 14 suggesting that the link is there.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 Q. Individuals have to weigh that; true?
- 17 A. If individuals want to even consider the debate,
- 18 and I'm not sure that all individuals do.
- 19 Q. Then they have to weigh those things.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 21 A. Wait. Are you asking me, if an individual is
- 22 going to think about this issue, then that individual
- 23 has to weigh the factors that are in this debate?
- 24 Q. Well, you said individuals have to make up their
- 25 own mind as to whether or not there is this causal

- 1 link between disease and smoking; correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And in doing so, it would be reasonable for them
- 4 to listen to and to believe one side or the other in
- 5 this debate; isn't that true?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 7 question.
- 8 A. I don't know. I think some individuals will
- 9 ignore both sides and make up their own mind.
- 10 Q. I understand.
- 11 A. So I'm not --
- 12 Q. I just want to know what you meant when you said
- 13 that individuals have to decide this for themselves.
- 14 Isn't that what you meant, is that individuals would
- 15 have to listen to both sides of this debate and make
- 16 up their mind based upon which of them they believe?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I believe there are a lot of individuals that
- 19 don't listen to anybody; they just make up their own
- 20 mind.
- 21 Q. Do you want me to read my question back?
- 22 A. No. I'm giving you the same answer because
- 23 that's what I think.
- 24 Q. Then tell us what you meant when you said that
- 25 individuals have to make up their mind for themselves

- 1 about this.
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. An individual has to make up his own mind as to
- 4 whether to smoke or not.
- 5 Q. My question is: Do you believe it is reasonable
- 6 for an individual in this culture, be it, he or she,
- 7 a Minnesota resident or not, to believe that it's
- 8 uncertain as to whether a scientific causal link has
- 9 been drawn between smoking and certain diseases?
- 10 A. I don't know that I'm in a position to make that
- 11 determination.
- 12 Q. You think that's an open question?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. Does
- 14 she think what's an open question?
- 15 Q. Do you understand the question?
- 16 A. I understand that I've given you the answer.
- 17 Q. Well I don't think that's so, but I --
- 18 Do you understand the question? Whether or not
- 19 you want to answer is a different matter.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: I would object to that
- 21 comment.
- MR. McKENNA: I understand you do.
- 23 A. My belief is an individual has to make up his or
- 24 her own mind, using whatever information he or she
- 25 chooses. So I'm not going to speak for someone else,

- 1 I'll speak --
- 2 I can't.
- 3 Q. You don't think the issue is a closed issue with
- 4 respect to the causal relation between tobacco and
- 5 certain diseases.
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. What I think doesn't matter as far as other
- 8 people making up their own mind.
- 9 Q. With all respect, ma'am, I'm entitled to ask you
- 10 what it is that you think, and if you don't want to
- 11 answer that, then perhaps we'll come back another day
- 12 and have you answer it.
- Do you want to have the question read back to
- 14 you?
- 15 A. Yes, please.
- 16 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, I object to that.
- 17 This witness has answered very directly to the
- 18 question you asked about her personal belief.
- MR. McKENNA: Oh, that's nonsense. She has
- 20 not. Now you can note your objection all you want
- 21 to, but if you're going to make a speech about it,
- 22 I'll make the counter-speech.
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, I'm objecting to
- 24 your speech. You made the speech here.
- 25 MR. McKENNA: All right. Let me see if I

- 1 can't wrap all of this up.
- 2 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 3 Q. Individuals have to make up their own mind about
- 4 smoking; correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And in doing so they can rightfully listen to
- 7 the public debate about this subject, consisting of
- 8 the tobacco industry and others on one hand saying
- 9 that the scientific causal link has not been proven
- 10 between tobacco and illness, and the Surgeon General
- 11 and others on the other hand saying it certainly has;
- 12 is that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. It is true that they can rely on that if they
- 15 want to.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- 17 A. That they can rely on both sides of the debate,
- 18 if I understand the question, yes.
- 19 Q. In your preparation to give testimony in this
- 20 case, did you review any documents that were produced
- 21 by the tobacco industry about their practices and
- 22 beliefs?
- 23 A. The only thing I think I've seen produced is --
- 24 by the -- by the tobacco industry generically are --
- 25 under the umbrella, is the opinions. That's all I

- 1 remember seeing at the moment, the -- the damage
- 2 model.
- 3 Q. You told me yesterday that you had seen the
- 4 amended complaint in this case. Had you seen that in
- 5 Louisiana before going to New York the first time to
- 6 consult on this case?
- 7 A. I don't remember.
- 8 Q. When you did read the complaint before giving
- 9 your opinion, did you make any notations on it?
- 10 A. I don't think I did.
- 11 Q. Have you ever made any notations on it?
- 12 A. I would have to go back and look at it. I don't
- 13 believe I did. I don't believe there are any
- 14 notations on the complaint. I will -- I will go back
- 15 and look, but I don't remember doing any.
- 16 Q. While you were working at the Medicaid Fraud
- 17 Control Unit in Mississippi, was there a SURS unit in
- 18 the state of Mississippi?
- 19 A. There was a computer unit, yes, surveillance
- 20 unit from which we got information about claims that
- 21 were rejected, et cetera.
- 22 Q. Do you have any more detail for me about the
- 23 staffing of that unit? How many people?
- 24 A. I don't remember the staffing, I just remember
- 25 the reports.

- 1 Q. And what form did the reports take when they
- 2 came to you?
- 3 A. Quite often what we were given to look at were
- 4 computer printouts of provider/recipient/service
- 5 provided data.
- 6 Q. What about that?
- 7 A. What provider provided what service to what
- 8 recipients, and usually how much was paid, that type
- 9 of information.
- 10 Q. Well, I mean, are you saying that there was
- 11 nothing more pointed about it than that, that a
- 12 provider provided a service of a certain kind to a
- 13 recipient and received a certain amount of money,
- 14 that's all there was to it?
- 15 A. No. There were --
- 16 That's the data that were on these things, on
- 17 the report, on the computer printouts. There
- 18 were --
- 19 Then you have reports of whether this particular
- 20 provider, for example, was, for example, an outlier.
- 21 Was this material -- this report, did it show excess
- 22 activity in a particular area, for example, in
- 23 services provided, et cetera. Lots of times what was
- 24 provided to us was what we asked for.
- 25 Q. But some things were provided to you routinely?

- 1 A. We got reports from Program Integrity.
- 2 Q. From whom?
- 3 A. Program Integrity in Medicaid.
- 4 Q. In Medicaid? That was a state unit in Medicaid?
- 5 A. I don't remember if that was considered a
- 6 division of --
- 7 I have to go back and look at the organizational
- 8 charts, what it actually said. But yes, that's who
- 9 would send complaints to us. And if we needed, for
- 10 example, cost reports, copies of cost reports or
- 11 whatever to review, we requested it from Program
- 12 Integrity.
- 13 Q. You said you don't remember how many people were
- 14 in SURS. Do you remember the names of any of the
- 15 people in the SURS unit in Mississippi while you were
- 16 at the Attorney General's office?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Did you ever meet any of those people
- 19 face-to-face?
- 20 A. I don't remember.
- 21 Q. Do you know where they were located?
- 22 A. I don't remember.
- 23 Q. What was the title of that organization?
- 24 A. Well we always talked about Program Integrity
- 25 and utilization stuff. I don't remember what the

- 1 exact title was.
- 2 Q. But Program Integrity and utilization, was that
- 3 the same as the SURS unit?
- 4 A. I think they were not the same thing. I cannot
- 5 remember who produced which data to us.
- 6 (Discussion off the record.)
- 7 A. I do not remember where they sat physically. I
- 8 just don't remember.
- 9 Q. Do you remember for sure whether there was a
- 10 separate unit, a separate SURS unit from this Program
- 11 Integrity and utilization function that you
- 12 described?
- 13 A. I remember discussions about the computer
- 14 systems, what they did, what types of things that
- 15 they would kick out. I don't remember as we sit here
- 16 where they sat.
- 17 Q. Okay. Not where they sat, my question is: Do
- 18 you believe it was a separate organization, the SURS
- 19 unit?
- 20 A. I cannot remember if SURS was a separate unit,
- 21 completely separate from Program Integrity or not.
- 22 Q. And you can't remember any individuals that were
- 23 associated with either one of those functions; is
- 24 that true?
- 25 A. No, as we sit here today, I don't recall the

- 1 names.
- 2 Q. Okay. Do you have a recollection whether you
- 3 can recall the name or not of -- of dealing
- 4 face-to-face with any person from either one of those
- 5 organizations from Mississippi SURS or from Program
- 6 Integrity and utilization?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. Yes, I dealt on a face-to-face basis with
- 9 Program Integrity, for example, particularly when I
- 10 requested cost reports, et cetera, to review.
- 11 Q. And when you dealt face-to-face with them, was
- 12 that a matter of them -- you'd call up and request
- 13 something and then they would produce it and you'd
- 14 look at it, or did you have conversations and
- 15 consultations with them? What happened?
- 16 A. I requested documents that I would like to look
- 17 at; for example, cost reports.
- 18 Q. Okay. Cost reports with respect to a specific
- 19 subject?
- 20 A. Well, for example, on one occasion it was a
- 21 review of cost reports of nursing homes.
- 22 Q. Of all nursing homes?
- 23 A. No, not all nursing homes.
- 24 Q. You were targeting somebody at the time and you
- 25 asked for data having to do with the subject of your

- 1 investigation; is that true?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Did you ever review for any reason the
- 4 functioning of the SURS or the Program Integrity and
- 5 utilization unit in Mississippi to determine what it
- 6 is that they did and how well they did it?
- 7 A. We had meetings where we discussed the computer
- 8 system --
- 9 Q. All right.
- 10 A. -- and what it might and might not do, --
- 11 Q. Okay. What is your --
- 12 A. -- what you might and might not get.
- 13 Q. Anything else?
- 14 A. And, as I say, sat down and reviewed what are
- 15 computer printouts to see what kind of data would
- 16 actually show up on them.
- 17 Q. What did you understand that this unit could do
- 18 with its computers? What sorts of things could it
- 19 generate?
- 20 A. It could -- it could generate the reports I
- 21 reported to you already. You could ask it --
- 22 For example, we could request reports of this
- 23 type, this type, this type. Like what I'm -- how
- 24 much -- what all has this provider provided, one
- 25 type, what -- how much -- how many services, et

- 1 cetera, has a particular recipient received, it would
- 2 spit that out. You could ask it to do several
- 3 things. It would kick out things like
- 4 over-utilization or look at over -- look at
- 5 over-utilization. It would kick out if edits were
- 6 set for a certain thing. But basically, unless there
- 7 was a pattern, the computer system would not kick
- 8 out --
- 9 I mean this was the subject of some of our
- 10 conversations. If there were not patterns by a
- 11 provider, for example, they would not be kicked out
- 12 of the system.
- 13 Q. What kind of patterns?
- 14 A. Patterns such as a particular provider providing
- 15 too many services or a whole lot more services of a
- 16 particular type of service than his peers, his or her
- 17 peers. A particular provider we looked at, I believe
- 18 dollars, what the provider had provided for X amount
- 19 of time, was a whole lot different from his peers.
- 20 That type stuff would kick out. Not if -- in
- 21 addition to mistakes. I mean the computer system
- 22 will -- will check if on its face a claim is okay,
- 23 and if there's not something patently wrong with it,
- 24 that claim will still go through. So even checking
- 25 for a pattern is -- sometimes even that's after the

- 1 fact.
- 2 Q. My question is: What other kinds of reports
- 3 could this computer spit out in the Mississippi
- 4 Program Integrity and utilization? Do you have any
- 5 recollection of any others?
- 6 A. That I specifically looked at or talked
- 7 about? I mean it's my understanding, although I
- 8 never -- I didn't see them, it could generate reports
- 9 that had to be --
- 10 That's all I specifically remember at the
- 11 moment.
- 12 Q. Did this unit have analysts who would take what
- 13 the computer generated as far as these unusual
- 14 patterns and study them?
- 15 A. It's my understanding they looked at outliers.
- 16 Q. And who is the --
- 17 They had analysts there who looked at outliers,
- 18 meaning people whose reported experience, according
- 19 to the computer, was outside the norm; is that what
- 20 you're talking about?
- 21 A. That's my assumption. I did not ever see them
- 22 do it. I did not even ask them if they
- 23 specifically --
- 24 Q. Did you know what they mean by "outliers?"
- 25 A. Do I know what they mean by "outliers?"

- 1 Q. Yes.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. What do they mean by "outliers?"
- 4 A. It means basically what I was just describing to
- 5 you, someone who -- a provider, for example, who
- 6 provides many more services than his peers, or more
- 7 dollars, or recipients who received more services,
- 8 that type of thing.
- 9 Q. Okay. And once they identified some outliers, I
- 10 take it by means of the computer edits that you have
- 11 alluded to, what did they do with that list of
- 12 outliers?
- 13 A. I don't know what all they did with the list of
- 14 outliers.
- 15 Q. Any other work they did that you know of?
- 16 A. No. Basically what I was concerned with was
- 17 what we discussed.
- 18 Q. As far as your use of this unit when you were in
- 19 the Mississippi Attorney General's office, your
- 20 primary use of it was to ask them for information
- 21 about a specific recipient or a specific provider;
- 22 correct?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. Yes. If I made a request, it was primarily for
- 25 a specific -- that's correct, a specific provider or

- 1 specific recipient.
- 2 Q. At any time while --
- 3 A. Or services.
- 4 Q. -- you were --
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: I'm sorry. Were you
- 6 finished?
- 7 A. Or services provided. I mean --
- 8 Q. At any time when you were in the Mississippi
- 9 Attorney General's office, did someone from this unit
- 10 come to you and say, "We've analyzed this provider
- 11 who's an outlier and he does 10 times what other
- 12 people do in this area, " and provide you with any
- 13 follow-up data with respect to that person, and ask
- 14 you to do something?
- 15 A. I don't remember if anyone came to me directly.
- 16 Q. Do you know whether or not, once they generated
- 17 these outlier reports, whether they did any further
- 18 audits of these people?
- 19 A. I don't remember whether they did audits or
- 20 not. I mean it's not something I questioned them
- 21 about.
- 22 Q. Was this unit the source of any of the cases
- 23 that you prosecuted or investigated while you were at
- 24 that office?
- 25 A. The Program Integrity asked us to look at some

- 1 cases. Now -- but I can't tell you specifics.
- 2 Program Integrity did. I don't know if that came --
- 3 what the particular route was, but we did get some
- 4 requests from Program Integrity.
- 5 Q. Some requests to look at cases, meaning what?
- 6 What kind of look at those cases would you do? Would
- 7 you investigate them somehow?
- 8 A. Yes. You would -- you would order records to
- 9 try to figure out what actually happened.
- 10 Q. So they would come to you basically with a --
- 11 They would come to you with a computer-generated
- 12 report that indicated that somebody was an outlier
- 13 and suspect, and that you're supposed to do the
- 14 investigation from there, including ordering the
- 15 records; is that right?
- 16 A. Primarily it would come to us if they thought it
- 17 was fraud.
- 18 Q. All right. My point is: How far along would it
- 19 be when it came to you and what kind of investigation
- 20 would your people do?
- 21 You would order the medical records. Is that
- 22 what you said?
- 23 A. Quite often, yes, we did go and --
- 24 Again, as I say, by the time they referred to
- 25 us, they were considered to be a fraud case, and so

- 1 we were looking at --
- Yes, we would do our own investigation.
- 3 Q. Okay. But had they already ordered the medical
- 4 records and analyzed them by the time they came to
- 5 you?
- 6 A. I don't remember whether they had or not. I
- 7 mean we would have done our own investigation
- 8 regardless.
- 9 Q. You mean you'd go back and redo the
- 10 investigation they did? If they'd ordered the
- 11 records and looked at them, you would do it all over
- 12 again?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. We would send investigators --
- 15 Q. To do what?
- 16 A. -- to facilities to find out -- to check with
- 17 recipients and to check with -- to check for records,
- 18 perhaps medical records, obviously. Quite often we
- 19 would ask to see the full medical record, which
- 20 might --
- 21 Q. To see what?
- 22 A. The full medical record, which perhaps had not
- 23 been looked at before, but --
- 24 By the time it would come to us, I mean we
- 25 treated it as a fraud, as a fraud case, not as

- 1 anything else, so that was our concern.
- 2 Q. You indicated that you would do your own
- 3 investigation regardless. Does that mean that you
- 4 didn't feel that you could rely upon the
- 5 investigation that had been done by this other unit?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. Different people investigate things in different
- 8 ways depending upon what it is they're investigating
- 9 and how they're trained. We were a criminal unit
- 10 primarily, although we did civil, but our
- 11 investigators were trained to do criminal
- 12 investigations, and that's what we were
- 13 investigating, and therefore that's how we would
- 14 approach it. And if we --
- Whatever we needed to do, we did.
- 16 Q. Okay. And I'm trying to find out what it is you
- 17 did. Have you described the things that your
- 18 investigators would do?
- 19 A. Our investigators would look --
- 20 It depended upon the case. They would, for
- 21 example, interview recipients, if needed.
- 22 Q. The SURS unit or the Program Integrity --
- 23 A. I'm talking about ours.
- 24 Q. I understand that. My -- my question is: The
- 25 Program Integrity unit or the SURS unit, whichever

- 1 unit it was that brought you this case, hadn't talked
- 2 to recipients? They didn't do that?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I don't remember.
- 5 Q. You don't remember. Okay.
- 6 Do you have any recollection of approximately
- 7 what percentage of volume of cases in your unit at
- 8 the Attorney General's office might have come from
- 9 the SURS or Program Integrity and utilization unit?
- 10 A. No. I would have to go back and look at the --
- 11 at the reports.
- 12 Q. At the time that you were at Mississippi, was
- 13 the term "SURS" something that you were familiar
- 14 with?
- 15 A. That's a term I heard, but I'm not sure that we
- 16 actually called the unit that name at the time. I
- 17 simply don't remember that. I mean we're talking
- 18 about the computer system, but --
- 19 Q. Do I understand your conclusion correctly that
- 20 you are unable to estimate a percentage of
- 21 expenditures in the Minnesota Medicaid program which
- 22 are diverted by fraud and abuse beyond saying that it
- 23 is a substantial amount?
- 24 A. I believe it's substantial, yes. And I believe
- 25 that, from what I've seen so far anyway, I have

- 1 nothing to lead me to believe it's less than what has
- 2 been projected in different studies that have been
- 3 done nationally.
- 4 Q. And those national studies, as you understand
- 5 them, project what percentage of expenditures are
- 6 diverted by fraud and abuse?
- 7 A. We see studies that talk about expenditures in
- 8 the different health payment systems in the United
- 9 States that are made which shouldn't be made or
- 10 should not have been made. The base -- the bottom
- 11 figure that you normally see is 10 percent. One of
- 12 the latest studies from the OIG says that, I believe,
- 13 the number of payments that were erroneous or should
- 14 not have been paid, somewhere around 14 percent. I
- 15 have to go back and look at the actual study.
- 16 Q. Let me try my question again. I want to come
- 17 back to what you just said about OIG.
- 18 The national studies that you are alluding to
- 19 project what percentage of expenditures in the
- 20 Medicaid fraud and abuse -- or in the Medicaid
- 21 program being diverted by fraud and abuse?
- 22 A. Most studies will give you an indication that no
- 23 matter which payment system you see, the belief is
- 24 that it's at least 10 percent.
- 25 Q. All right. So "no matter which system," what

- 1 you mean, you're -- you're including Medicaid,
- 2 Medicare, private health organizations such as Blue
- 3 Cross Blue Shield, everybody; is that what you're
- 4 saying?
- 5 A. Yes. I'm saying that many of these reports lump
- 6 it all together, and there's no reason to believe
- 7 that there's a big difference between the systems.
- 8 Q. Your sense, then, of the literature and the
- 9 expertise that you have studied is that no matter
- 10 what kind of system you have, and therefore, I
- 11 presume, no matter what kind of preventive programs
- 12 you have, you're going to have 10 percent fraud and
- 13 abuse; correct?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 15 A. No, that's not what I said.
- 16 Q. Well --
- 17 A. Or at least that's not what I meant to say.
- 18 Q. All right. What did you mean to say?
- 19 A. I mean to say that reports that have looked at
- 20 our systems as they are constructed, Medicare,
- 21 Medicaid being two of them, and if you have a system
- 22 that functions very much in the same way as far as
- 23 payments go, then quite often -- almost all the
- 24 studies, I believe, say somewhere around 10 percent.
- 25 Now if it's --

- I'm not testifying to any kind of system that's
- 2 different. But if they're basically designed much
- 3 the same way, then I'm saying that 10 percent is -- I
- 4 believe to be a bottom-line figure.
- 5 Q. Now I guess I don't understand what it is that
- 6 you're saying. I thought you were telling me that
- 7 your sense was that no matter what kind of
- 8 health-care delivery and payment system, there was
- 9 going to be a minimum of 10 percent fraud and abuse
- 10 in it.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 12 Q. Did I misunderstand that?
- 13 A. You misunderstood it.
- 14 Q. Okay. So are you saying that only Medicaid has
- 15 10 percent fraud and abuse?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. And what other kinds of systems have 10 percent
- 18 fraud and abuse as a matter of course?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. Medicare.
- 21 Q. All right.
- 22 A. If it is a health-care payment system that is
- 23 set up very much like Medicare and Medicaid where
- 24 payment claims are reviewed on a post-payment basis
- 25 for the most part, for example, then it's going to

- 1 be, I believe -- I agree with the studies that say --
- 2 I've seen nothing to make me believe any
- 3 different, that it's not going to be true that
- 4 erroneous payments are made at a level lower than
- 5 what the reports are telling us.
- 6 Q. Now I think that I'm going to ask you to tighten
- 7 up your focus a little bit. And you understand that
- 8 we're not here concerned about erroneous payments but
- 9 about fraud and abuse.
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 Q. Do you understand that?
- 12 A. No. That's not what I was asked to look at.
- 13 Q. Okay. You were asked to look at the percentage
- 14 of the Minnesota Medicaid expenditures and those for
- 15 Blue Cross and Blue Shield and for general assistance
- 16 medical coverage in Minnesota that were erroneous,
- 17 not those that were a matter of fraud and abuse?
- 18 A. I was asked to look at payments that should not
- 19 have been made, including fraud and abuse.
- 20 Q. All right. And you weren't asked to separate
- 21 out those that were made by mistake from those that
- 22 were the subject of fraud and abuse; is that true?
- 23 A. Ultimately I've been asked to look at claims
- 24 that have been made erroneously, I mean -- and to try
- 25 and figure out if that is substantial.

- 1 Q. Where in your report do you allude to an opinion
- 2 with respect to erroneous payments as opposed to
- 3 fraud and abuse?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Would you like her to go
- 5 through that now, counsel, page by page? Your
- 6 question covers all of a -- of a -- of a
- 7 lengthy report.
- 8 MR. McKENNA: Yeah, let's do it. Let's get
- 9 going here.
- 10 Q. Show me where you talk about erroneous
- 11 payments. Show me where you describe your opinion in
- 12 those terms as opposed to fraud and abuse.
- Or isn't it true that you testify in your report
- 14 about fraud and abuse, the extent of fraud and abuse
- 15 in health programs, fraud and abuse detection and
- 16 enforcement efforts in the Minnesota Medicaid
- 17 program, fraud and abuse detection and enforcement
- 18 efforts in GAMC, fraud and abuse detection methods in
- 19 Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota, isn't that what
- 20 your report -- report addresses?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: I object to the form,
- 22 counsel. The report says what it says. You have
- 23 it. We have it. Anybody can look at it.
- 24 Q. All right. I -- let me --
- 25 Let me try this to make sure I understand what

- 1 you're saying. Your opinions here have to do with
- 2 the broad universe of payments which shouldn't have
- 3 been made, and you include with them those which were
- 4 made pursuant to clerical errors as well as those
- 5 made pursuant to fraud and abuse; is that right?
- 6 A. Ultimately I will, yes.
- 7 Q. Well, I mean is that what's addressed in your
- 8 report? Do you not know what the general subject
- 9 matter of your report is?
- 10 A. Yes, I know.
- 11 Q. And is it that you address in your report the
- 12 broad universe of payments which shouldn't have been
- 13 made, including those made by clerical error and
- 14 those made pursuant to fraud and deceit?
- MR. LINVILLE: I'm going to object to this,
- 16 counsel. If you have a specific reference in the
- 17 report, I think you should -- you should refer her to
- 18 that.
- 19 Q. Do you have the question in mind?
- 20 A. I have written a report which I'm at liberty to
- 21 amend when I get through with my study, when I'm
- 22 completely through.
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Incidentally, it's two hours
- 24 and five minutes. You know, I'm concerned about a
- 25 break time.

- 1 MR. McKENNA: Yes. And maybe we can use a
- 2 bit of a break time. I won't ask her to do that off
- 3 the record. We'll be back in a few minutes then.
- 4 (Recess taken.)
- 5 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 6 Q. Ms. Overall, please turn to your report, page
- 7 three, the first paragraph under the heading of
- 8 "Topics Covered in this Report." Please read the
- 9 first full paragraph to yourself. You don't need to
- 10 read it out loud.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Have you had a chance now to read to yourself
- 13 the first full paragraph on page three of your
- 14 report?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And does that refresh your recollection as to
- 17 whether your report addresses the question of, first
- 18 of all, general characteristics of the Medicaid
- 19 program and of the General Assistance Medical Care
- 20 program on the one hand, and fraud and abuse on the
- 21 other?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And your report does not address the broader
- 24 universe of payments which should not have been made
- 25 as you said earlier; does it?

- 1 A. I'll have to go through this report, but there
- 2 are places in it, if I -- I will have to find them,
- 3 where I have used the term "inappropriate payments,"
- 4 and that's why I -- that's the universe that --
- 5 that -- fraud abuse, yes, or inappropriate payments.
- 6 And I think I have mentioned in this report
- 7 inappropriate payments in explaining.
- 8 Q. Let me -- let me start again. Is it correct
- 9 that you understand your mission here is to provide
- 10 testimony as to the extent to which Minnesota
- 11 Medicaid payments, together with those made by GAMC
- 12 and Blue Cross Blue Shield, have been diverted
- 13 because particular payments should not have been
- 14 made, rather than to limit yourself to fraud and
- 15 abuse in those programs?
- 16 A. I am looking at inappropriate payments. Abuse,
- 17 for example, is not fraud. But payments that are
- 18 inappropriately made can also be abuse of the system.
- 19 Q. Let me try my question again. Would you be more
- 20 comfortable having the reporter read it, or do you
- 21 want me to restate it, or do you have in mind what my
- 22 original question was?
- 23 A. I've lost --
- MR. LINVILLE: Object.
- 25 A. I've lost it.

- 1 Q. All right. Let me try it again. Is it your --
- 2 you understand -- strike that.
- 3 Is it your understanding that what you are
- 4 supposed to be doing here today as an expert
- 5 consultant is offering testimony about the extent to
- 6 which Minnesota Medicaid, GAMC, and Blue Cross Blue
- 7 Shield have had payments diverted by reason of a
- 8 broad universe of payments which should not have been
- 9 made, including clerical errors and mistakes as well
- 10 as fraud and abuse?
- 11 A. Yes, because those types of errors can be
- 12 considered to be an abuse of the system.
- 13 Q. Well a clerical error is an abuse of the system,
- 14 is that what you're saying?
- 15 A. I'm saying that "abuse" is very widely defined.
- 16 Q. Well define "abuse" for me, please.
- 17 A. Abuse basically is when a payment is made when
- 18 it shouldn't have been made, not on the basis of
- 19 fraudulent intent of the party who received the
- 20 remuneration or the service. Abuse can be
- 21 over-utilization, but abuse can be a lot of other
- 22 things.
- 23 Q. Including clerical errors, such as simply
- 24 hitting the wrong key stroke on a computer?
- 25 A. The system is being abused if there is an

- 1 enormous amount of money going out that should not
- 2 be.
- 3 Q. Well do you include within "abuse" clerical
- 4 errors such as hitting the wrong key stroke on a
- 5 computer?
- 6 A. It's possible to include it in that, yes.
- 7 Q. Do you include that, not is it possible. Do you
- 8 include that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And do you include within the definition of
- 11 "abuse" the utilization of an incorrect form, for
- 12 example?
- 13 A. Anything that can result in payments that should
- 14 not be paid could be considered an abuse of the
- 15 system.
- 16 Q. All right. So when you offer your opinions
- 17 about the extent of fraud and abuse here, you are
- 18 including clerical errors and other non-intentional
- 19 difficulties which lead to payments which shouldn't
- 20 have been made; is that right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Please turn to page 13. Is this not, in
- 23 paragraph A., a place where you set forth the
- 24 definition of fraud and abuse which you purport to
- 25 utilize throughout your report?

- 1 A. It's where I give an example of a definition of
- 2 fraud and abuse.
- 3 Q. No, ma'am, that's not my question. Please try
- 4 to focus on my question.
- 5 Is this not the place where you set forth the
- 6 definition of fraud and abuse that you are utilizing
- 7 in your report?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: I object to that question.
- 9 A. You have to read it within context, and you have
- 10 to look at the first sentence of the paragraph.
- 11 Q. I am looking at the entire paragraph.
- Does this paragraph, paragraph A., set forth the
- 13 definition of fraud and abuse that you purport to
- 14 utilize throughout the remainder of your report?
- 15 A. It gives an example.
- 16 Q. No, ma'am. My question is does this set forth
- 17 the definition of fraud and abuse that you purport to
- 18 use throughout your report? Not an example.
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: I object to the question.
- MR. McKENNA: I understand.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: The question has been asked
- 22 and answered three times.
- MR. McKENNA: Not -- not at all.
- 24 A. You have to read the first sentence of the
- 25 paragraph to understand what the rest of the

- 1 paragraph says.
- 2 Q. I am reading the first sentence, I'm reading the
- 3 entire paragraph, and I want to know whether this
- 4 paragraph, all of paragraph A. on page 13, sets forth
- 5 the definition of fraud and abuse that you purport to
- 6 utilize throughout your report.
- 7 A. The first sentence of that paragraph
- 8 discusses --
- 9 Q. Can you not answer my question "yes" or "no"?
- 10 A. I am trying to answer your question, counsel.
- 11 Q. You are not answering my question "yes" or
- 12 "no." It's a "yes" or "no" question. Can you
- 13 answer "yes" or "no"?
- 14 A. No, I cannot. No, I cannot.
- 15 Q. Okay. Then go ahead and answer in whatever
- 16 fashion you feel you must.
- 17 A. In the intro sentence I discuss unwarranted or
- 18 inappropriate expenditures of health-care dollars,
- 19 and then I do quote an example of a definition of
- 20 fraud and abuse. But there are a jillion of them out
- 21 there.
- 22 Q. And you're suggesting that you simply picked one
- 23 at random and not one which you thought was useful
- 24 and instructive with respect to your report?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 Q. Is that what you're saying?
- 2 A. I'm saying I cited a definition.
- 3 Q. You cited a definition which you intended to be
- 4 relied upon by people who reviewed this report in
- 5 construing your opinions; did you not?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. This definition was put in here to try to give
- 8 whoever reads it an idea of what the difference is
- 9 between fraud and abuse when you're trying to
- 10 distinguish abuse from fraud.
- 11 Q. And what you meant by those terms; true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. It meant what I just said.
- 14 Q. So you are saying that among all the universe of
- 15 definitions of fraud and abuse, you picked this one,
- 16 but you are not representing this to be the
- 17 definition of fraud and abuse that you utilize; is
- 18 that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: And by "this," you're
- 20 referring to the full paragraph?
- MR. McKENNA: All of paragraph A., right.
- MR. LINVILLE: All of paragraph A.
- 23 A. The definition there serves to show the
- 24 difference between fraud and abuse. There's an
- 25 intent for fraud that's not required in abuse. Now

- 1 all the other things you've asked me about constitute
- 2 instances in which inappropriate payments are made
- 3 where there is no intent.
- 4 Q. Does paragraph A. constitute the definition of
- 5 fraud and abuse which you intend to be utilized in
- 6 construing your opinions?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. It is there to show the difference in fraud and
- 9 abuse.
- 10 MR. McKENNA: Please read the question
- 11 back, Mr. Reporter.
- 12 (Record read by the court reporter.)
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. It was put there to show the difference in fraud
- 15 and abuse.
- 16 Q. Will you not tell me whether or not you intended
- 17 this definition to be relied upon by people who were
- 18 construing your opinion?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. As I say, the first sentence of this paragraph
- 21 talks about inappropriate expenditures. This is a
- 22 definition that shows the difference in fraud and
- 23 abuse.
- 24 Q. All right. Let me come at it from the other
- 25 direction then. Are you saying that you did not

- 1 intend for people to rely upon this definition of
- 2 fraud and abuse when construing your opinions?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I intend for someone who reads this to be able
- 5 to tell the difference between fraud and abuse by
- 6 reading this opinion and what it -- I mean this
- 7 definition, which shows that abuse -- that fraud
- 8 requires intent, abuse does not.
- 9 Q. And this definition is what you intended people
- 10 to utilize in reading and understanding your report.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the -- to the
- 12 form.
- 13 A. I'm telling you what I mean.
- 14 Q. Well you're not telling me whether you intended
- 15 people to rely upon this in reading your report. Did
- 16 you intend for people to rely upon this definition in
- 17 reading your report?
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 A. To be able to tell the difference between fraud
- 20 and abuse, yes.
- 21 Q. To rely upon it to tell the difference between
- 22 fraud and abuse. Okay.
- Now did you define fraud and abuse anywhere else
- 24 in your report?
- 25 A. I think this is the only definition I cited.

- 1 Q. Did you define fraud and abuse anywhere else in
- 2 your report, whether you cited a definition or not?
- 3 A. I think I did not spell out a definition again.
- 4 Q. Is there a place in your report -- and take all
- 5 the time you want -- in which you say that erroneous
- 6 and mistaken payments are to be included within the
- 7 definition of fraud and abuse?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Are you --
- 9 Apart from paragraph A. here which you've
- 10 already referred to?
- 11 MR. McKENNA: Absolutely. Anywhere in the
- 12 report. Take all the time you want.
- 13 A. I have used the term "inappropriate
- 14 expenditures" in here several times.
- 15 Q. Show us --
- 16 Show me where. You can just tell me by page
- 17 number and I'll find it.
- 18 A. Bottom of page 15, paragraph at the bottom of
- 19 page 15.
- 20 Q. All right. Just give me a moment.
- 21 Perhaps you can direct me by counting up from
- 22 the bottom. Where is there a line that says that
- 23 mistaken payments, including those by clerical
- 24 errors, are to be included within fraud and abuse?
- 25 MR. LINVILLE: I object to the form of that

- 1 question.
- 2 Q. Or are you simply saying that you used the words
- 3 "inappropriate payments" there?
- 4 A. I used the term "inappropriate payments."
- 5 Q. All right. But no place on that page is
- 6 inappropriate payments included -- or defined to
- 7 include clerical errors, right, or the like?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 9 Q. Is that true?
- 10 A. It does not say that in words, but an
- 11 inappropriate payment is an inappropriate payment --
- 12 Q. Okay.
- 13 A. -- regardless of the reason.
- 14 Q. All right. At the top, when you are citing
- 15 different kinds of fraud and abuse, citing common
- 16 examples, you don't include anything there with
- 17 respect to erroneous or mistaken or clerical-error
- 18 payments; do you?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. It does not say that, but if someone made a
- 21 claim, for example, for services that were never
- 22 performed and it was made by mistake.
- 23 Q. Okay. Please continue and find the other places
- 24 where you made reference to mistaken or erroneous
- 25 payments as being included within fraud and abuse.

- 1 A. On page 16 where I'm talking about recovery
- 2 efforts.
- 3 Q. And again the use of the term "inappropriate" is
- 4 what you're referring to?
- 5 A. Yes, because I'm saying that "enforcement
- 6 efforts which constitute -- concentrate on seeking
- 7 recovery of inappropriately paid funds...."
- 8 Q. All right. But again, "inappropriate" is not
- 9 defined as including erroneous payments or clerical
- 10 errors on that page anywhere; is it?
- 11 A. It is not specifically set out, but if it were
- 12 paid inappropriately, regardless of fraud or abuse,
- 13 it's inappropriate.
- 14 Q. Please go ahead. You say "regardless of fraud
- 15 and abuse." Is that what you're saying? Did I
- 16 understand you correctly?
- 17 A. Regardless of what you are choosing to -- the
- 18 words you're choosing to use. What I am trying to
- 19 say to you is we're talking about trying to --
- 20 recovery of inappropriately paid funds not including
- 21 funds -- it includes all funds that were paid for
- 22 claims that were paid inappropriately.
- 23 Q. I understand that you say that "inappropriate"
- 24 includes clerical errors and erroneously-made
- 25 payments. What I want you to do is to tell me where

- 1 you specify in some way in your report that clerical
- 2 errors and erroneously-made payments are included
- 3 within fraud and abuse.
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 5 A. I have used the term "inappropriate payment"
- 6 again on page 17.
- 7 Q. All right. Find a place where you use the words
- 8 "clerical errors" or "mistaken payments" or words to
- 9 that effect in that connection. I understand that
- 10 you claim that "inappropriate" does include those
- 11 terms, and I want to know where that's spelled out.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. I can only tell you what is there. The term
- 14 "inappropriate payment" is used several times and it
- 15 includes inappropriate payments of all types.
- 16 Q. But there isn't a place where it spells out that
- 17 "inappropriate payments" does include clerical
- 18 errors and other innocently-, erroneously-made
- 19 payments; is that right?
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 21 A. I'm saying that can be under the umbrella of
- 22 abuse.
- 23 Q. No, ma'am. I want to know whether or not there
- 24 is a place anyplace in your report where you make it
- 25 clear that erroneous payments, payments made by

- 1 clerical error or on the basis of another innocent
- 2 explanation, that that is included within fraud and
- 3 abuse. Do you spell that out anywhere?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 5 A. In my mind it is included.
- 6 Q. And is it spelled out somewhere in your report?
- 7 A. My report complete -- consistently talks about
- 8 inappropriate payments.
- 9 Q. I understand that. Do you not understand my
- 10 question?
- 11 A. Yeah. I understand what an inappropriate
- 12 payment is --
- 13 Q. No, ma'am.
- 14 A. -- and --
- 15 Q. Do you understand my question?
- MR. LINVILLE: Excuse me. Please don't
- 17 interrupt the witness.
- 18 Q. Do you understand my question? Is there a --
- 19 I'll try it again. Is there a place in your
- 20 report where you spell out in some fashion that the
- 21 term "inappropriate payments" or the term "abuse"
- 22 includes erroneous payments, mistaken payments, or
- 23 payments made by clerical error or other innocent
- 24 explanation, that those are included within the term
- 25 "abuse?"

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 Q. Did you spell that out anywhere?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 Q. If so, just tell me and we'll move on.
- 5 A. I've answered you. I've answered you.
- 6 Q. Okay. You have not pointed out a place to me
- 7 where you explain in here that payments made by
- 8 clerical error, by mistake, are included within fraud
- 9 and abuse. You're just telling me that that's what
- 10 you include in your own mind of that definition. Is
- 11 that a fair statement?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. No, that's not a fair statement.
- 14 Q. Then tell me a page/line of your report --
- MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, --
- 16 Q. -- where you spell that out.
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: -- we've just been through
- 18 that. She's referred you to a whole number of pages
- 19 and lines.
- 20 MR. McKENNA: Counsel, she has not done any
- 21 sort of --
- You want to go to the court about this? I
- 23 understand the judge is free right now. If you're
- 24 contending that she answered the question and that
- 25 I'm abusing her somehow by pursuing this, let's go.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: I think you are abusing the
- 2 witness a little bit.
- 3 Q. Is it in here?
- 4 A. What is in there is that there --
- 5 I'm talking about inappropriate payments over
- 6 and over again. There's a definition in there about
- 7 fraud and abuse that is there to show the difference
- 8 between fraud and abuse, and that is the intent
- 9 required for fraud that's not required for abuse.
- 10 That's what I'm telling you.
- 11 Q. A page upon which you allude in any fashion to
- 12 the inclusion of clerical errors, erroneous/mistaken
- 13 payments within the definition of abuse, can you cite
- 14 such thing? If you can't, we'll just move on.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 A. I've given you all the answers that I can give
- 17 you.
- 18 Q. And you have been as precise as you can be; is
- 19 that what you're saying?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Okay. Now is it your testimony that those who
- 22 study the subject of fraud and abuse in connection
- 23 with health-care delivery programs routinely include
- 24 within their definition of fraud and abuse clerical
- 25 errors and other payments that were made pursuant to

- 1 an innocent mistake?
- 2 A. When you see --
- 3 I believe that when you see reports that talk
- 4 about inappropriate payments, they include all the
- 5 above.
- 6 Q. Including payments made erroneously or by an
- 7 innocent mistake.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Can you think of any -- of a source in
- 10 which that is spelled out in the definition of what
- 11 is fraud and abuse?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. What I think I just said was when you see the
- 14 term "inappropriate payment" used, it is -- it
- 15 constitutes everything that is an inappropriate
- 16 payment of any type, when you see a report talking
- 17 about inappropriate payments.
- 18 Q. Do you not understand my question?
- 19 A. I guess I don't.
- 20 Q. Okay. Do you recall another source, another
- 21 expert, another study, another report, which defines
- 22 fraud and abuse in such a fashion as to include
- 23 payments made by clerical error or innocent mistake?
- 24 A. What I recall is the latest OIG reports, I
- 25 believe, are talking about inappropriate payments.

- 1 Studied everything, not -- I mean --
- 2 Q. Can you please look at Appendix II-B to your
- 3 report and tell me where the OIG report that -- which
- 4 one of those is the OIG report that you referred to.
- 5 A. I have not read the OIG report that I'm
- 6 referring to, I -- I don't pretend to tell you that
- 7 I've read it, it's just that numbers that have
- 8 been -- I've heard in conversation at Tulane.
- 9 Q. What is --
- 10 Is the OIG report referred to in Appendix II-B?
- 11 A. No, it is not.
- MR. McKENNA: Move to strike all reference
- 13 to the OIG report; failure to comply with the court's
- 14 order with respect to expert discovery.
- 15 Q. Now you go on, after defining fraud and abuse,
- 16 to discuss fraud and abuse in operation. In the next
- 17 section of your report you discuss, in an overall
- 18 fashion, some things about the filing of claims in
- 19 Minnesota Medicaid.
- I want to direct your attention to page 14,
- 21 second full paragraph. Do you have that in front of
- 22 you, ma'am?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. You make the statement that "Minnesota Medicaid
- 25 does generally not" -- excuse me, that "Minnesota

- 1 Medicaid generally does not examine claims before
- 2 they are paid." What is your source for that
- 3 statement?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: I'm sorry, where are you on
- 5 page 14, counsel?
- 6 MR. McKENNA: The first -- the first full
- 7 sentence of the first -- or of the second full
- 8 paragraph. It begins with the words "Unlike much
- 9 insurance in areas other than health care...."
- 10 A. That's --
- 11 You can determine that from some of the
- 12 depositions where they're asked.
- 13 Q. Now what would constitute examining claims
- 14 before they are paid?
- 15 A. It would be an instance of what's sometimes
- 16 called prepayment review, which I don't say never
- 17 happens in Minnesota, I say generally it doesn't.
- 18 That's usually where a -- for some reason a provider
- 19 has been targeted or a recipient has been -- has been
- 20 targeted, and that before any payments will be made,
- 21 for example, for that particular provider or that
- 22 particular recipient, when a claim comes in for one
- 23 of those, payment -- claims will not be paid until
- 24 there is a complete review of the claims.
- 25 Q. Now you prefaced this by referring to a

- 1 circumstance in which for some reason a provider or a
- 2 recipient has been targeted. Did I understand you
- 3 correctly?
- 4 A. Identified. I don't know what word I said, but,
- 5 for whatever reason, chosen to be looked at before
- 6 claims are paid by just -- without a review.
- 7 Q. Now this would be an on-hands review by a human
- 8 being?
- 9 A. Could be different types of review. It's up to
- 10 the agency to decide. But --
- 11 Q. Well is that what you have in mind when you talk
- 12 about examining a claim before it's paid?
- 13 A. There are many ways to examine claims payments
- 14 before they're made.
- 15 Q. And could one of those ways be a computer system
- 16 which has a series of edits to spot anomalies with
- 17 the claim?
- 18 A. Well it can be a computer system that's
- 19 programmed to do whatever you tell it to do.
- 20 Q. So a program -- excuse me. A computer program
- 21 system that reviews a claim before it's paid might
- 22 satisfy your definition of examining a claim before
- 23 it's paid; is that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: As used on page 14 here?
- 25 MR. McKENNA: Sure. I presume it's not

- 1 used any differently on page 14 than elsewhere in the
- 2 report.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Well you referred her to a
- 4 sentence -- I'm just trying to keep the record clear
- 5 here -- at the start of this line of questioning.
- 6 MR. McKENNA: Well, thank you.
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: I want to make sure we're
- 8 still on it.
- 9 Q. Let's make it clear. You don't use that term
- 10 differently anywhere in this report, do you?
- 11 Examining a claim, you don't change the definition of
- 12 that concept.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 14 A. The concept is the same, yes.
- 15 Q. That's what I'm trying to get at. And one of
- 16 the ways to do it would be to have a computer program
- 17 that analyzed the claim to spot anomalies about it.
- 18 That would be one way to review it before it's paid;
- 19 true?
- 20 A. Well theoretically all claims are reviewed by
- 21 the computer before -- for anomalies before it's
- 22 paid.
- 23 Q. So that doesn't satisfy your definition of
- 24 reviewing the claim before it's paid; true?
- 25 A. If you're talking about the normal run-the-

- 1 claims-through-the-computer-system, no.
- 2 Q. No. I'm talking about a computer system with a
- 3 program containing edits which would spot anomalies
- 4 about the claim.
- 5 A. Anomalies such as?
- 6 Q. Such as --
- Well, do you know that the Minnesota Medicaid
- 8 Information System has a system of edits that reviews
- 9 claims before they're paid? Were you aware of that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Do you know how many edits are in place?
- 12 A. A lot.
- 13 Q. Do you know how many are in place?
- 14 A. I don't remember. I remember a discussion of
- 15 it. A lot.
- 16 Q. Does 997 sound right?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I don't remember the number.
- MR. LINVILLE: You have to specify a point
- 20 in time, counsel, if you're going to have -- if
- 21 you're going to have a number.
- 22 Q. Does that sound about right, 900 plus?
- 23 A. I don't remember. I've seen different numbers.
- 24 But there are a lot, I'll agree with you on that.
- ${\tt 25}$  Q. There are a lot. And did you review the system

- 1 to see whether, in your opinion, there ought to be
- 2 additional edits in place?
- 3 A. From testimony that I have read, the edits that
- 4 are in place are not catching all the appropriate --
- 5 inappropriate paid claims, so therefore there are not
- 6 enough, if you want to look at it that way.
- 7 Q. No, I don't. I want you to answer my question.
- 8 Did you review the system to determine whether
- 9 additional edits ought to be in place?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. I think that you can put edits in place ad
- 12 nauseam and they won't connect or find all the
- 13 errors.
- 14 Q. Please try to focus on my question. Did you
- 15 review the system to determine whether additional
- 16 edits ought to be in place?
- 17 A. I reviewed the system to see whether it was
- 18 catching inappropriate payments.
- 19 Q. I'm sorry, ma'am. I'm going to have to ask you
- 20 to answer my question. Can you do that?
- 21 Did you review the system to determine whether
- 22 additional edits ought to be in place?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 Q. Either you did or you didn't.
- 25 A. And I'm trying to tell you that I think the

- 1 addition of more and more edits is not -- will never
- 2 stop inappropriate payments being made.
- 3 Q. Okay. So no matter how many edits were put in
- 4 there wouldn't be enough to satisfy your criteria for
- 5 prior review; is that what you're saying?
- 6 A. I'm saying --
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 8 A. -- that it can never catch a hundred percent of
- 9 inappropriate payments.
- 10 Q. All right. Now you're not contending that the
- 11 system has to be so perfect as to catch a hundred
- 12 percent of the inappropriate payments; are you?
- 13 That's not your -- not your opinion; is it?
- 14 A. My opinion is that the system is not catching
- 15 all the inappropriate -- a substantial number of the
- 16 inappropriate payments being made.
- 17 Q. Okay. It's not catching a substantial number.
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. And by "substantial number," do you have in mind
- 20 a percentage? What do you mean by "substantial?"
- 21 A. At this point all I believe we know is it's a
- 22 large number.
- 23 Q. A large ordinal number or a large percentage
- 24 number?
- 25 A. Impossible to give a concrete --

- We know it's a large dollar number from reports
- 2 we have seen.
- 3 Q. What reports --
- 4 You're talking about the national reports that
- 5 you have alluded to?
- 6 A. We know nationally it's a huge dollar number.
- 7 Q. Okay. But you don't have an opinion in terms of
- 8 a percentage about what "substantial" means as you
- 9 use that term; is that right?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. I think substantial -- I take no issue with what
- 12 we -- what --
- 13 I've seen nothing to tell me that it's less than
- 14 10 percent.
- 15 Q. No, ma'am, I don't want to know what you've seen
- 16 that tells you it's less. I want to know what your
- 17 opinion is. That's the whole purpose for us being
- 18 here today.
- 19 Is it your opinion that a certain percentage of
- 20 Medicaid payments are inappropriate, and that that's
- 21 what you mean by the term "substantial?"
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. My opinion is that there is a substantial amount
- 24 or number of claims that are paid inappropriately. I
- 25 believe that there's nothing to indicate that it's

- 1 less than the 10 percent that we see nationally.
- 2 Q. Okay. But you are not saying that it is your
- 3 opinion that it is 10 percent.
- 4 A. I believe it's not less than 10 percent.
- 5 Q. Okay. You think it's not less than 10 percent,
- 6 so does "substantial" mean not less than 10 percent?
- 7 Should we agree upon that for proceeding?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 9 A. We'd have to look at both the percentage and the
- 10 dollars to see the complete damage to the system.
- 11 Q. Okay. All right. Then I will cut to the chase
- 12 then.
- 13 What is your opinion as to the percentage of
- 14 Medicaid programs in Minnesota which are
- 15 inappropriately paid?
- MR. LINVILLE: You may just want to reread
- 17 that, counsel.
- 18 MR. McKENNA: Thank you. I did misuse the
- 19 term "programs."
- 20 Q. I want to know what percentage of the payments
- 21 in the Minnesota Medicaid program are inappropriately
- 22 paid, in your opinion.
- 23 A. In my opinion, I think it's not less than 10
- 24 percent.
- 25 Q. All right. And the source of that opinion is

- 1 that you haven't seen anything that makes you think
- 2 it's less than what national studies indicate; is
- 3 that right?
- 4 A. What I have seen is testimony and documents that
- 5 show, yes, that there are substantial numbers of
- 6 inappropriate payments made under the Medicaid
- 7 system.
- 8 Q. Okay. And how is it that you arrived at the 10
- 9 percent figure? That's what I'm getting at. Is 10
- 10 percent something that you are simply saying that
- 11 some people speak about 10 percent on a national
- 12 level and you haven't seen anything to convince you
- 13 that it's different here? Is that what I understand
- 14 your testimony to be?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 A. I have seen nothing yet to convince me it's any
- 17 lower than that. I'm still reviewing documents. I'm
- 18 not to give you any kind of a percentage, I'm not
- 19 ready to do that, but I don't believe it's going
- 20 to --
- 21 You asked my opinion.
- 22 Q. Well have you been instructed not to give me a
- 23 percentage?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. But you're not ready to give a percentage. You

- 1 don't have an opinion as to percentage right now; is
- 2 that what you're saying?
- 3 A. I have an opinion that I believe it's not below
- 4 what we see consistently, which is at least -- is a
- 5 bottom figure of 10 percent.
- 6 Q. Okay. And I want to know how you got there.
- 7 What I heard you saying a while ago is that nothing
- 8 you have seen persuades you that Minnesota is any
- 9 different than the 10 percent figure that you've seen
- 10 projected in the national studies that you've alluded
- 11 to.
- 12 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form, that
- 13 mischaracterizes the testimony.
- 14 A. I said I've seen nothing to make me believe it's
- 15 lower than that.
- 16 Q. Right. Okay. Any other reason to use the term
- 17 10 percent, in your opinion?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Let's get back to the question of determining
- 20 what a prior examination of a claim or a claim
- 21 examination before it's paid would consist of.
- 22 You've indicated that no number of computer edits
- 23 that would review a claim before it's paid would be
- 24 sufficient to eliminate this substantial number of
- 25 erroneous claims that you've talked about. Did I

- 1 understand that correctly?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. It would depend upon the type of edits you were
- 4 able to program into the computer.
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 A. There are some things that happen that there's
- 7 no way any computer could pick up.
- 8 Q. Okay. Give me an example.
- 9 A. No computer can tell if a service that was
- 10 claimed was actually provided.
- 11 Q. Okay. Any other examples?
- 12 A. No computer can detect if a payment was
- 13 medically necessary.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. There may be situations in which the -- there
- 16 are changes being made in the system and not yet made
- 17 in the computer system for a period of time, there
- 18 are claims that will go through because there's no
- 19 edit there to catch. No computer can tell you
- 20 whether there's a mistake in beneficiary -- in
- 21 beneficiary eligibility. What a computer can do is
- 22 read numbers.
- 23 Q. Any other examples?
- 24 A. I'm sure there are many others that I just can't
- 25 think of at the moment.

- 1 Q. Okay.
- 2 A. Those are --
- 3 Q. All right. So for those reasons a prior
- 4 computer review of a claim would not be adequate to
- 5 meet your concerns about prior review of claims; is
- 6 that true?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. Wait. Are you talking about just a run through
- 9 the computer with edits in place?
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. If a claim is submitted and the service that was
- 12 provided was not medically necessary, for example, a
- 13 computer with edits cannot pick that up, that's
- 14 correct.
- 15 Q. Okay. So because the computer can't do those
- 16 things, the computer would never -- that no computer
- 17 review would ever be sufficient in your view --
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 Q. -- to satisfy your -- to satisfy your
- 20 pre-payment review concern.
- 21 A. Wait. I think we're confusing two issues here.
- 22 Q. Well I don't think we are, but let's go on to --
- Let me refer you over to page 18 and see if we
- 24 can get this into a better context here. In the
- 25 second full paragraph on page 18 you state that, in

- 1 the first sentence, that "It is generally recognized
- 2 among prosecutors and health policy experts" --
- 3 A. Wait, wait. I'm sorry, wrong page.
- 4 Okay.
- 5 Q. You say, "It is generally recognized among
- 6 prosecutors and health policy experts that the only
- 7 reliable way to detect fraud and abuse is to examine
- 8 an individual claim submitted by a provider for
- 9 payment," and then you add, "In my opinion, there is
- 10 no other reliable way to detect fraud and abuse."
- 11 Do --
- 12 Have I quoted your opinion correctly?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Okay. And you go on to say that, just as you
- 15 just said in your testimony, that a computer can't
- 16 determine whether services were actually performed,
- 17 et cetera, et cetera.
- Now is that saying that unless something other
- 19 than a computer is used for prepayment examination of
- 20 claims, that fraud and abuse will not be reliably
- 21 detected? Is that what you're saying?
- 22 A. I am saying that there are quite a number of
- 23 instances of fraud and abuse which fall under the
- 24 umbrella -- well, with the examples that I've given
- 25 of situations where what happened was not medically

- 1 necessary, that particular instance could never be
- 2 caught, I believe, with --
- 3 A computer cannot read that.
- 4 Q. I asked you a much more global question than
- 5 that, and it is a simple paraphrase of your
- 6 testimony. Isn't it your opinion that a computer
- 7 review before payment could never reliably detect
- 8 fraud and abuse? Is that what you say in your
- 9 report, and isn't that your opinion?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. There is some abuse that computer programs will
- 12 pick up.
- 13 Q. Why do you not want to answer my question?
- 14 A. Because you're misreading what I'm saying.
- 15 Q. Well let me ask you this: Is there any other
- 16 reliable way to detect fraud and abuse than prior
- 17 examination of an individual claim submitted by a
- 18 provider for payment?
- 19 A. To -- to detect --
- 20 Q. It's right here. It's just in your report.
- 21 Can't you agree with what's in your report?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form,
- 23 counsel. Why don't you let her finish her answer.
- 24 Maybe we could read the question back and read
- 25 her answer up to the time she was cut off.

- 1 MR. McKENNA: No. I want --
- 2 If she has a problem with the question, she can
- 3 state that.
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, the only reason I'm
- 5 objecting is you cut her off in the middle of the
- 6 witness's answer. That's not fair.
- 7 MR. McKENNA: Then make your objection.
- 8 That's what you're here to do.
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: I did. I did.
- 10 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 11 Q. Do you have in mind the question? Should I
- 12 repeat the question?
- 13 A. Would you, please.
- 14 Q. All right. I understand -- I'll try it phrasing
- 15 it a different way. I understand your report to be
- 16 here that you're saying that prosecutors and health
- 17 policy experts say that the only way -- the only
- 18 reliable way to detect fraud and abuse is to examine
- 19 the claims submitted by the provider for payment, and
- 20 you say that's your opinion, too. Isn't that right?
- 21 A. Yes. I'm saying the only way we will ever
- 22 really know about what the extent of fraud and abuse
- 23 is is to look at the payments beforehand.
- 24 Q. Okay.
- 25 A. Because there's so many that cannot be picked up

- 1 by computer.
- 2 Q. All right. And the computer can't do that;
- 3 right?
- 4 A. A computer cannot detect all the fraud and
- 5 abuse, that's what I'm saying.
- 6 Q. Okay. So a human being has got to do it; right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. All right. And a human being, if he or she has
- 9 the resources to do it, can look into this situation
- 10 to find out whether a procedure that has been claimed
- 11 to have been done was actually done; right?
- 12 A. A human being can investigate it, yes.
- 13 Q. Okay. And in order to determine --
- 14 If Dr. X says, "I removed a mole from Mrs. Y,"
- 15 then that investigator, how would that person
- 16 determine whether or not that's a true statement?
- 17 A. One way is to ask the person who had the mole
- 18 removed.
- 19 Q. Good. They call up Mrs. Y and say, "Did Dr. X
- 20 remove the mole from you?" Right?
- 21 A. Possibility, yes.
- 22 Q. And of course if they wanted to make certain
- 23 that there wasn't some collusion between Mrs. X and
- 24 Dr. Y, they'd have to go out and look at the place
- 25 where the mole was removed from; right?

- 1 A. Well I would say that's beyond the realm of
- 2 possibility, but -- I don't know --
- 3 In every case, I don't know that that's the
- 4 case. I mean it's a hypothetical. It could possibly
- 5 happen.
- 6 Q. Well I mean you understand, don't you, that
- 7 sometimes fraud can consist of a collusion between a
- 8 patient and a doctor? Right?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. So in order to make certain that there was no
- 11 fraud involved in the transaction that I
- 12 hypothesized, an investigator might want to go out
- 13 and have a look at whether or not there was a scar
- 14 where that mole had been removed; true?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. And then just to make certain that that mole
- 17 hadn't been removed in childhood or maybe there was
- 18 something else going on, they might have to talk to
- 19 some people to say, "Did you see whether or not Mrs.
- 20 X used to have a mole?" Might have to do that;
- 21 mightn't they?
- 22 A. I won't say that's beyond the realm of
- 23 possibility.
- 24 Q. Well, if they wanted to make certain there was
- 25 no fraud, no collusion between Dr. Y and Mrs. X;

- 1 right?
- 2 A. If it was a fairly new scar, then there's no
- 3 need to go back to childhood, for example.
- 4 Q. Uh-huh. Well if it was a fairly new scar, it
- 5 still might not be Dr. X who removed it. Might have
- 6 been some other explanation; true?
- 7 A. True.
- 8 Q. Okay. So then -- then if they talked to some
- 9 people that said, "Yeah, I saw that she used to have
- 10 that mole and doesn't have it any more," they might
- 11 have to investigate whether those people had the kind
- 12 of close relationship with her that they were in fact
- 13 an accomplice, right, covering up for her in some
- 14 way?
- 15 A. Theoretically, that's possible.
- 16 Q. Okay. And if a person were going to investigate
- 17 whether or not a procedure is medically necessary,
- 18 the usual way to do that is to get the medical
- 19 records and review them and have them looked at by a
- 20 doctor of a similar degree of expertise or specialty
- 21 with the provider involved; true?
- 22 A. True.
- 23 Q. And they would get those records and they would
- 24 see whether or not this mole was the sort of thing
- 25 that might best have been left alone or whether it

- 1 needed to be removed for biopsy purposes or something
- 2 like that; right?
- 3 A. That's --
- 4 Q. True?
- 5 A. Could be, yes.
- 6 Q. And lawyers couldn't do that and investigators
- 7 couldn't do that. A doctor would have to do that to
- 8 be fair to all involved; true?
- 9 A. True.
- 10 Q. And to determine whether or not there was some
- 11 problem with beneficiary eligibility -- let's take,
- 12 for example, the hypothetical of someone who has lung
- 13 cancer and is in a chemotherapy program. In order to
- 14 determine whether that person was eligible for that,
- 15 it would probably be a matter of whether or not they
- 16 met the categorical assistance requirements of a
- 17 certain level of poverty or disability; wouldn't that
- 18 be so?
- 19 A. No, not necessarily.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 21 Q. Could be just because they were aged.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. No. You're asking me about recipient
- 24 eligibility?
- 25 Q. Yeah, beneficiary eligibility. You said that

- 1 that was an area of fraud that a computer couldn't
- 2 detect, and I want to explore with you what kinds of
- 3 things a human being might have to do to make certain
- 4 that that beneficiary was properly eligible.
- 5 And the beneficiary might put down on the form
- 6 that "I don't have any money."
- 7 A. That's a possibility, yes.
- 8 Q. And that that may be a substantial component in
- 9 their eligibility; right?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And how would a person go about investigating
- 12 whether or not that was a fraudulent statement,
- 13 saying "I don't have any money?"
- 14 A. Well that's back up at the outset. But again,
- 15 that's something that should have been checked when
- 16 the person enrolled, not that you're going out --
- 17 I mean ultimately we would have to investigate
- 18 it, but that's one of the things that should have
- 19 been checked into initially.
- 20 Q. By a human being.
- 21 A. Right.
- 22 Q. Sure.
- 23 A. Since it's done at a county level, the
- 24 enrollment process --
- 25 Q. Well, I mean, don't you agree with me that --

- 1 that the enrollment process consists of a man at best
- 2 sitting across the desk from somebody and they say,
- 3 "Do you have any money?" and he says, "No?"
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. Are you
- 5 talking about the Minnesota Medicaid enrollment
- 6 process?
- 7 MR. McKENNA: Sure, I am.
- 8 A. That's possible.
- 9 Q. Well, how would -- how would a human being,
- 10 prior to the payment of a claim, investigate whether
- 11 or not this person was eligible based upon his
- 12 statement that he didn't have any money? How would
- 13 they do that investigation?
- 14 A. Well there are lots of theoretical answers.
- 15 Check for bank statements, but you may not get the
- 16 records.
- 17 Q. Ask him for his bank statements?
- 18 A. Bank account numbers.
- 19 Q. Who would they ask about his bank account
- 20 numbers?
- 21 A. Him.
- 22 Q. Him, okay.
- 23 Suppose he said, "I don't have any bank account
- $24\,$  numbers," but he does, how would they -- how would
- 25 they find that out?

- 1 A. Could be difficult.
- 2 Q. Would be difficult.
- 3 Do you know whether or not the Minnesota
- 4 Medicaid insurance system cross-checks its data
- 5 against data supplied from other sources?
- 6 A. I believe it cross-checks data for things like
- 7 Medicare beneficiaries.
- 8 Q. Anything else?
- 9 A. I have read testimony about cross-checking, but
- 10 I'd have to go back and look at it and see what all
- 11 it was. I do remember that being in there.
- 12 Q. All right. All right. Getting back to the
- 13 prior examination, is it your opinion that in order
- 14 to reasonably reduce the level of fraud and abuse in
- 15 the Medicaid system, that Minnesota ought to have a
- 16 system in place that every individual claim is
- 17 reviewed by a human being before a payment is made?
- 18 A. I've not been asked to give an opinion to
- 19 anything like that. That's not what I've been asked
- 20 to look at and that's not what I'm trying to give an  $\,$
- 21 opinion on.
- 22 Q. So you don't have an opinion about that.
- 23 A. I'm not about to give an opinion on how to
- 24 change your Medicaid system. That's not what I've
- 25 been asked to do.

- 1 Q. All right. But you are saying that the failure
- 2 of the system to have a human being review those
- 3 claims in advance fails to reliably defect fraud and
- 4 abuse; are you not?
- 5 A. I am saying that the only way we would ever know
- 6 if every claim was completely true on its face would
- 7 be to do that.
- 8 Q. Do you have an opinion as to the cost per claim
- 9 that would be entailed in having a human being review
- 10 each one before it was paid?
- 11 A. Could be substantial.
- 12 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, --
- 13 A. I don't know.
- 14 MR. LINVILLE: -- it's three hours. When
- 15 you come to a good, logical point.
- MR. McKENNA: Fine. My only comment, Mr.
- 17 Linville, is it's now 12:00 o'clock and we are -- we
- 18 still have, what, four and a half hours of -- no, we
- 19 have more than that, we have a total of 12 hours for
- 20 this and we've gone seven and a half hours now, four
- 21 and a half hours left. Correct?
- MR. LINVILLE: I think that's right.
- MR. McKENNA: And I want to try to
- 24 accommodate any travel needs that you have because --
- 25 off the record.

- 1 (Discussion off the record.).
- 2 (Recess taken.)
- 3 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 4 Q. When you say it could be substantial, that is to
- 5 say, the cost of having a human being review every
- 6 claim before it's paid, you don't have a dollar
- 7 figure in mind.
- 8 A. No, I do not.
- 9 Q. Do you have an opinion as to the number of
- 10 additional staff it would take to conduct such a
- 11 prepayment review by human beings?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Do you have an opinion as to how much time on
- 14 the average for each claim would be required to do
- 15 this prepayment review by a human being?
- 16 A. Obviously it would vary.
- 17 Q. Do you know how many Medicaid claims there were
- 18 in any one year during the period of time that you've
- 19 studied in Minnesota?
- 20 A. I think I may have seen numbers, but I don't
- 21 remember them.
- 22 Q. Do you have an opinion --
- 23 I've asked you a series of questions now about
- 24 what it would take by way of personnel, cost, time,
- 25 to review every claim before it's paid. Do you have

- 1 an opinion as to how many additional personnel it
- 2 would take to conduct a reasonable degree of prior
- 3 review of claims, by human beings?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. I'll ask you to assume that there were some 23
- 7 million Medicaid claims in 1996 and ask if you agree
- 8 with me that it would be unreasonable to expect a
- 9 system to have a prior review of all of those claims
- 10 by a human being before they were paid?
- 11 A. I think it's not what I've been asked to do, to
- 12 say what I think the system should do, but to say
- 13 what is.
- 14 Q. Unfortunately, I think this is so closely
- 15 connected with your opinion as to the defect in the
- 16 system that I must ask your opinion.
- 17 Well if you've not thought about that --
- 18 A. I don't -- can I read --
- I don't remember the number you said.
- 20 Q. Twenty-three million I said.
- 21 A. I think it would be a very difficult thing to
- 22 do.
- 23 Q. You don't have an opinion as to whether it would
- 24 be unreasonable?
- 25 If you don't, that's fine, just say so and we'll

- 1 move on. But if you're evading my question for some
- 2 reason, I need to know where you're going.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 4 A. "Reasonable/unreasonable" are relative terms. I
- 5 think it would be extremely difficult to -- to do
- 6 what you just described.
- 7 Q. You don't have an opinion as to whether it would
- 8 be unreasonable; is that true?
- 9 A. I think it would be extremely difficult to do.
- 10 Q. Is there some reason why you can't or won't
- 11 answer my question about whether or not it's
- 12 unreasonable? Is it a confusing question to you?
- 13 A. No. I --
- 14 As I say, I believe what I've been asked to do
- 15 is say here's what is.
- 16 Q. Well I'm asking you to do something different.
- 17 I'm asking you whether or not it would be
- 18 unreasonable to have a human being review 23 million
- 19 claims before they were paid, obviously not the same
- 20 human being.
- 21 A. You have to look at the timeframe in that, and
- 22 if you are dealing with trying to make payments in a
- 23 timely fashion, given whatever you -- how you define
- 24 "timely fashion," that would be extremely difficult
- 25 to do, and in that case, perhaps unreasonable.

- 1 Q. Do you know what an ICD-9 code is?
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. Capital I, capital C, capital D, dash 9.
- 4 (Mr. Linville gestures to prompt the
- 5 witness to answer audibly.)
- 6 MR. McKENNA: You have to say "yes" or
- 7 "no."
- 8 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: You have to say "yes" or
- 10 "no." That's all I meant to say.
- 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 12 Q. What is it?
- 13 A. It's one of the coding systems used. I think it
- 14 stands for something like International Categorizing
- 15 Diseases.
- 16 Q. And you understand --
- 17 A. It's diagnosis that's used on the -- to -- to
- 18 classify things that you're billing for. It's one of
- 19 the things that's used.
- 20 Q. That's a fairly universally used thing, isn't
- 21 it, in insurance programs and in Medicaid?
- 22 A. ICD-9?
- 23 Q. Yes.
- 24 A. Yes. Fairly widely used.
- 25 Q. You don't find anything inappropriate about

- 1 using ICD-9 codes to analyze problems relative to
- 2 issues involving payments in the Medicaid program; do
- 3 you?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 5 A. Do I see anything wrong with using those codes?
- 6 Q. Yes.
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. And I take it that where you note that Robert
- 9 Baird agreed with you that there should be -- that
- 10 there is no other reliable way to detect fraud and
- 11 abuse than to have a prior examination of claims
- 12 before they're paid, you're not able to tell me where
- 13 in Mr. Baird's deposition he states that agreement;
- 14 are you?
- 15 A. I am not, sitting here at this moment.
- 16 Q. And if you had your file here, you would go to
- 17 Mr. Baird's deposition and leaf through it looking
- 18 for a page in which he states that agreement. Is
- 19 that how you'd do it?
- 20 A. Yes, that's how I'd do it.
- 21 Q. Would it be a fair statement of your opinion
- 22 that you believe that the state of Minnesota is not
- 23 detecting a substantial amount of fraud and abuse in
- 24 the Medicaid system, but that you don't have any
- 25 proposals as to how it could be done better?

- 1 A. I was not asked to even consider how it could be
- 2 done any better, just to analyze what exists, and
- 3 that's what I've done.
- 4 Q. Well I'm asking you now: Do you have any ideas
- 5 how it could be done better?
- 6 A. That's not something I --
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. I mean that's not something I have prepared to
- 9 talk about.
- 10 Q. So you don't have any opinions about how it
- 11 could be done better.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. It's not the purpose of my testimony.
- 14 Q. No, that's not my question, what the purpose of
- 15 your testimony is. My question is whether you have
- 16 any opinions as to how it could be done better.
- 17 A. Not something I speculated about.
- 18 Q. When you say you haven't speculated about it,
- 19 does that mean --
- Is that the same as saying you don't have any
- 21 opinions on it? When you -- when you say you haven't
- 22 speculated about it, you mean you haven't even
- 23 thought about it? Is that what you're saying?
- 24 A. I have not addressed that issue at all in
- 25 preparation for my testimony because that's not what

- 1 I've been asked to do.
- 2 Q. Okay. Can you point me to a Medicaid system in
- 3 another state or territory of the United States which
- 4 is more effectively run than Minnesota's, in your
- 5 opinion?
- 6 A. No, I'm not sure I could do that.
- 7 Q. Okay. Can you point me to an organization
- 8 similar to Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota which
- 9 has a more effective system of detecting fraud and
- 10 abuse in its payment system?
- 11 A. Not at this moment, no.
- 12 Q. What can you tell me -- strike that.
- 13 Describe for me the Minnesota process for
- 14 enrolling a provider in the Medicaid program.
- 15 A. The process, as I understand it, is having a
- 16 provider sign a provider agreement in order -- and
- 17 stating, you know, he's in good --
- 18 It's a provider agreement to -- to provide
- 19 services to Medicaid, and in return for that Medicaid
- 20 will pay for the services. And there's -- it's
- 21 basically not a difficult process.
- 22 Q. You know, I didn't ask you whether it was
- 23 difficult or not. I want you to describe it to me.
- 24 A. Well the basic part of it is signing an
- 25 enrollment agreement.

- 1 Q. All right. Is there anything else to it?
- 2 A. It's up to Medicaid to check -- actually do the
- 3 checking to show the provider is credentialed,
- 4 legitimately credentialed.
- 5 Q. What does Medicaid do in Minnesota on checking
- 6 on the provider?
- 7 A. As I understand, they check with licensure
- 8 boards, et cetera. I believe they check their own
- 9 records about the provider being dis -- I'm losing
- 10 words this morning. They do some --
- 11 They do routine checks to make sure he is a
- 12 provider in good standing, and basically if that's
- 13 the case, then he's given a provider number.
- 14 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether this
- 15 enrollment problem in Minnesota -- or enrollment
- 16 process for providers in the Minnesota Medicaid
- 17 program is deficient in some way?
- 18 A. There were -- I don't remember --
- 19 I don't remember whether it was addressed in
- 20 testimony about checking providers, for example, who
- 21 were -- had lost their license in other states, I
- 22 don't remember that being addressed.
- 23 Q. All right. But if that wasn't addressed, that
- 24 would be a defect.
- 25 Anything else?

- 1 A. Not that I remember sitting here, no.
- 2 Q. Are you aware of another Medicaid system in any
- 3 of the other states or territories that has, in your
- 4 opinion, a better system for enrolling providers from
- 5 the standpoint of preventing fraud and abuse?
- 6 A. There are some -- there are some ideas about
- 7 posting bond, et cetera, that's been done, but --
- 8 Q. No, no, not my question. My question is: Are
- 9 you aware of another Medicaid system in any of the
- 10 other states or territories that has, in your
- 11 opinion, a better system for enrolling providers from
- 12 the standpoint of preventing fraud and abuse?
- MR. LINVILLE: I object to that, counsel.
- 14 I think she was asking and she was cut off --
- 15 answering and she was cut off.
- 16 Q. Another system. Name it.
- 17 A. As I sit here I don't remember one I -- I
- 18 would -- that would have.
- 19 Q. All right. Now are there any nationally
- 20 suggested elements to a provider enrollment program
- 21 from the standpoint of detecting and preventing fraud
- 22 and abuse that are not implemented in Minnesota that
- 23 you know of?
- 24 A. As I say, there are ideas about having providers
- 25 post bond.

- 1 Q. Who has those ideas?
- 2 A. As I sit here I can't tell you. I'd have to go
- 3 back and look. And I -- I can't tell you if it's
- 4 been implemented. This is an idea that's out there,
- 5 and I don't know --
- 6 Q. Right. Any others?
- 7 A. That's --
- 8 Sitting here, that's the one that comes to mind.
- 9 Q. Let me follow up on the bond thing for a bit.
- 10 The idea would be that if Dr. X wants to make
- 11 Medicaid claims, he would have to file a bond with
- 12 the state. In what amount?
- 13 A. It might -- as I say, this is not something --
- I mean I have to go back and look at this before
- 15 I tell you completely, but the theory behind it is
- 16 maybe all providers. That's not been decided.
- 17 Perhaps providers that have a record of abuse in the
- 18 past. I need to go back and -- for you to rely on
- 19 what I'm trying to tell you, what I also said, to go
- 20 back and review it.
- 21 Q. Are you telling me that in your opinion that is
- 22 a good idea?
- 23 A. I'm saying it's a possibility.
- 24 Q. But you're not saying it's a good idea because
- 25 you haven't thought about it yet; right?

- 1 A. I'm saying it's a possibility.
- 2 Q. Is it a good idea?
- 3 A. There are several factors that you have to
- 4 consider for the goodness -- the well -- the well
- 5 being, so to speak, or the integrity or whatever you
- 6 want to call of the program, and you have to weigh
- 7 factors such as would providers pay this and still
- 8 enroll in Medicaid as providers if you demanded this,
- 9 and so I can't just say, yeah, I think that would be
- 10 a great idea. I mean there are factors to be
- 11 weighed.
- 12 Q. So you haven't come to a conclusion on that
- 13 subject.
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Okay. I do notice that with respect to
- 16 enrolling providers, I want to draw your attention to
- 17 page 16, the second full paragraph of C. Would you
- 18 read the second full paragraph to yourself.
- 19 A. Yes, I have.
- 20 Q. And this is a paragraph in which you refer to
- 21 the pay and chase aspect of how you see this system,
- 22 that that's traced back to the early years of
- 23 Medicaid when they were trying to enroll providers
- 24 and they wanted to make the system user friendly.
- 25 Are you suggesting they had trouble recruiting

- 1 providers for the Medicaid program, that doctors were
- 2 reluctant to do it for some reason?
- 3 A. Well any reluctance on the part of providers was
- 4 the amount of money that Medicaid would pay, which is
- 5 usually lower than what they would receive for --
- 6 from a private insurance company, for example, and so
- 7 part of the thinking behind it was make it -- I've
- 8 used the term "user friendly," and -- because yes, we
- 9 need providers or -- we can't pay them as much as
- 10 other people can, so --
- 11 Q. Is it your opinion or are you testifying that in
- 12 Minnesota, the rates of payment for services are
- 13 lower for Medicaid than they are in private insurance
- 14 programs?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 Q. Or do you know?
- 17 A. I cannot recall as I sit here the specific
- 18 testimony, but I believe it is -- there are
- 19 references in some of the depositions to the fact
- 20 that some of the payments are lower.
- 21 Q. Well I just want to know whether it's --
- 22 Was it your opinion when you wrote this report
- 23 that there had to be the additional enticement of a
- 24 user-friendly program to get doctors to enroll in the
- 25 Medicaid system because they were reluctant to do it

- 1 otherwise owing to the fact they'd be paid less than
- 2 private insurance would pay them? Is that what your
- 3 testimony is?
- 4 A. My testimony is that's one of the reasons, yes.
- 5 Q. Okay. So in order to overcome this reluctance,
- 6 which was related to lower payments, they made it
- 7 easier for the doctors. Is that what you're saying?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 9 A. They made it as easy as possible for the doctors
- 10 to enroll, yes.
- 11 Q. And are you suggesting that they made it too
- 12 easy for them and that that ended up producing a
- 13 problem in the system?
- 14 A. I'm saying that in order for this system to
- 15 work, there must be providers, and it is a fact that
- 16 Medicaid historically pays less than other types of
- 17 reimbursement, and it has sometimes been difficult to
- 18 get providers to desire, anyway, to do this, and so
- 19 the system was set up not to be an impediment, not to
- 20 make it even harder for providers to enroll, and
- 21 therefore treat Medicaid -- the Medicaid population,
- 22 but to keep it --
- 23 Q. Well follow me through on this. Isn't the gist
- 24 of a substantial part of your report that Minnesota
- 25 Medicaid is a -- has a pay and chase enforcement

- 1 system? Isn't that what your opinion states in this
- 2 report?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And you don't think that's a good system. Isn't
- 5 that also your opinion?
- 6 A. What I was asked to give an opinion about is
- 7 whether the system as it exists recoups inappropriate
- 8 payments, not to give a quality measure or a, you
- 9 know, seal of approval or not, but just to say what
- 10 is. And that's what I've done.
- 11 Q. Do you want my question reread?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object, counsel.
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Are you --
- You're not going to answer it no matter how it's
- 16 done, rephrased or reread, --
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object, counsel.
- 18 Q. -- when you say you weren't asked to make any
- 19 qualitative judgments about it except to determine
- 20 whether or not it was recouping -- whether or not it
- 21 would recoup by way of inappropriate payments; right?
- 22 A. Well I was not asked to say this is a good
- 23 program or a bad program.
- 24 Q. Well then why did you use language in your
- 25 report like "the shortcomings of pay and chase

- 1 enforcement?" Isn't that a qualitative judgment on
- 2 the pay and chase system?
- 3 A. There are shortcomings.
- 4 Q. Right. So you did express your opinion about
- 5 this; right? And now why is it that you won't answer
- 6 my questions about those opinions?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Objection.
- 8 A. Because they're part of the analysis. Here is
- 9 the analysis.
- 10 Q. All right.
- 11 A. That's not asking for a qualitative opinion.
- 12 Q. Okay. I'm -- okay. You don't think that
- 13 "shortcomings" is a qualitative opinion with respect
- 14 to this?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 Q. You didn't mean that to be a criticism?
- 17 A. I think it's a fact.
- 18 Q. I understand that. But you meant it to be a
- 19 criticism of the system; didn't you?
- 20 A. I meant it to be if a pay and chase system
- 21 exists, here are the, quote, shortcomings with such a
- 22 system. I mean it's --
- 23 Q. All right. Tell me --
- 24 A. -- still evaluation of what --
- 25 Q. Tell me what shortcomings it has then.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. I meant it as a fact. I did not mean it as this
- 3 means this whole system is good or bad.
- 4 Q. Okay. Well in fact do you think that the
- 5 Minnesota Medicaid system is, overall, run
- 6 appropriately and efficiently?
- 7 A. I think that the Minnesota Medicaid program is
- 8 paying out a lot of money inappropriately.
- 9 Q. And their efforts to prevent doing that, are
- 10 those sufficient and reasonable efforts, in your
- 11 opinion?
- 12 A. I am still reading -- I'm still reading
- 13 depositions, rereading, and before I answer that
- 14 question I would reserve the time to -- to reread.
- 15 Q. So as of right now you haven't formed an opinion
- 16 along those lines.
- 17 A. I'm not at this moment ready to say I think --
- 18 It's just not something I'm ready -- I would be
- 19 willing to give an opinion on.
- 20 Q. I want to ask you about the Minnesota computer
- 21 system with respect to processing and analysis of
- 22 Medicaid claims. You know that much of the discovery
- 23 dealt with that subject. Do you know what I'm
- 24 talking about, the computer system?
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. Do you know what MSIS stands for?
- 2 A. Medicaid Statistical Information System.
- 3 Q. And what does MMIS stand for?
- 4 A. It is the -- it is the actual information
- 5 system, MMIS, Minnesota Medicaid Information System I
- 6 think.
- 7 Q. And has there been more than one version or --
- 8 of each of those?
- 9 A. There's been only one version of MMIS.
- 10 Q. Okay. Can you tell me what you know about the
- 11 transition from one to the other?
- 12 A. From what I've read in the depositions I've seen
- 13 so far, there was a period of time when that
- 14 transition was made where apparently -- I'm using
- 15 qualitative terms here -- it was difficult for the
- 16 Medicaid system to, with the staff it had, try to
- 17 make payment for claims. Apparently during that time
- 18 they had to hire extra staff, et cetera, in order to
- 19 get it done.
- 20 Q. And as you've reviewed that situation through
- 21 the depositions, did you draw the conclusion as to
- 22 whether this difficulty was something that was
- 23 inherent in the transfer of one system to another, or
- 24 was it the product of an error or a series of errors
- 25 on the part of the Medicaid people in Minnesota?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. I'm still not clear in my mind whether --
- 3 There was a -- a window of time there, as I
- 4 recall, where there was a debate about do we try to
- 5 tailor MMIS I with more edits or not do that because
- 6 we're about to input another system? Then they
- 7 actually did put in the other system, and during that
- 8 transition there was difficulty. But I'm -- I -- I
- 9 can't sit here telling you that it was the fault of
- 10 somebody specific. I mean I'm not --
- No, that's not something I'm willing to say now
- 12 because I don't know that.
- 13 Q. All right.
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. From the description that you've gotten of this
- 16 computerized system, do you have criticisms of the
- 17 effectiveness or efficiency of this system?
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Objection. We've been
- 19 talking about at least three here. All three of the
- 20 computer systems?
- MR. McKENNA: Sure.
- MR. LINVILLE: And I'll object to the form.
- 23 Q. Do you want me to try it again?
- 24 A. No, I'll just read. I just lost it.
- 25 (Witness reads computer screen.)

- 1 A. From what I remember of the testimony as I sit
- 2 here, there is discussion of the fact that MMIS I was
- 3 quite rigid and not perhaps as easy to change the
- 4 edits as the Medicaid system or program or whatever
- 5 word you want to use would have hoped, and so I know
- 6 that there were some problems that arose because of
- 7 that.
- 8 There's still the fact that no matter what
- 9 computer system is put in, that it can only do what
- 10 it's programmed to do, and therefore the situation
- 11 will continue that there will be claims that may go
- 12 through the system, even with edits in place, that
- 13 will be paid inappropriately.
- 14 Q. Do you know of another Medicaid system in the
- 15 other states or the territories that is more useful
- 16 from the standpoint of assisting in the detection or
- 17 prevention of fraud and abuse than that employed in
- 18 Minnesota?
- 19 A. As I sit here, no.
- 20 Q. And do you have specific suggestions for
- 21 improvement of the Minnesota computer system to make
- 22 it more efficient with respect to the detection or
- 23 prevention of fraud and abuse?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. Again, this is not -- this is not anything I was

- 1 asked to do. That's not anything I've done. What I
- 2 was asked to do -- been asked to do is analyze the
- 3 system.
- 4 Q. Let me try to make it clear for you. Perhaps we
- 5 can eliminate this kind of exchange in the future.
- 6 I'm not particularly concerned about what you were
- 7 asked to do. I'm entitled to explore your opinions,
- 8 and that's my question. So whether you were asked to
- 9 do it or not, please answer my question. And if you
- 10 don't have an opinion, that's fine, just say so.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 A. At this moment I have -- I --
- 13 (Witness looks for the question on
- 14 the computer screen.)
- 15 THE REPORTER: Why don't I read the
- 16 question. It's probably off the screen now.
- 17 (Pending question read by the court
- 18 reporter.)
- 19 A. As I sit here, no, right now.
- MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, we're at about the
- 21 time we talked about breaking for lunch, but whenever
- 22 you'd like.
- MR. McKENNA: I'm content to break now for
- 24 lunch if --
- 25 MR. LINVILLE: Okay.

### CONFIDENTIAL

337

1	MR. McKENNA: Off the record.
2	(Luncheon recess taken at 12:47 o'clock
3	p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 AFTERNOON SESSION
- 2 (Deposition reconvened at 1:15 o'clock
- 3 p.m.)
- 4 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 5 Q. Do you know what S-U-R-S, the acronym, SURS
- 6 stands for?
- 7 A. Surveillance and Utilization Review System, I
- 8 believe.
- 9 Q. And have you heard of something called SIRS?
- 10 A. Yes, I have.
- 11 Q. And what is that?
- 12 A. Stands for --
- Well actually I have it written in this report.
- MR. LINVILLE: Could you refer to a page,
- 15 counsel, for that?
- 16 THE WITNESS: It's on page 19.
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Okay.
- 18 A. Surveillance and Investigation Review.
- 19 Q. And what do you understand to be the
- 20 relationship between the SIRS and SURS?
- 21 A. From what I've seen in testimony, they're quite
- 22 often used pretty much interchangeably.
- 23 Q. Has anybody ever told you that it's not
- 24 Surveillance and Investigation, but Surveillance and
- 25 Integrity Review System?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Have you as a part of your efforts to form a
- 3 basis for your opinion in this matter looked at the
- 4 functioning of similar units in other states or
- 5 territories of the United States?
- 6 A. I have looked at SURS units in addition to
- 7 Minnesota, but not in preparation for -- for this
- 8 case.
- 9 Q. All right. However, for whatever reason you
- 10 looked at them, can you point me to a state or
- 11 territory that has a SURS unit which you believe
- 12 functions more effectively in the area of preventing
- 13 or detecting fraud and abuse than the Minnesota SURS
- 14 unit?
- 15 A. Not as we sit here at this moment. That's not
- 16 to say I won't look at more before trial, but --
- 17 Q. Now when you were at Mississippi, you worked in
- 18 the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit. Do you understand
- 19 that many states have a similar unit?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And do you understand that such units are
- 22 funded, at least in part, on a startup basis by some
- 23 federal -- additional federal financial participation
- 24 out of the Medicaid program?
- 25 A. Yes. I understand that, yes. It's --

- 1 Q. Do all states have a Medicaid Fraud Control
- 2 Unit?
- 3 A. It's not true that they've all been implemented
- 4 yet. Initially they did not when the program
- 5 happened, but --
- 6 Q. And as a part of your effort to form a basis for
- 7 your opinions in this case, did you look at the
- 8 Minnesota Medicaid Fraud Control Unit?
- 9 A. I looked at the documents that have been
- 10 produced, I mean that have been produced to me to
- 11 look at, yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. And aside from your knowledge of the
- 13 Mississippi Medicaid Fraud Control Unit and what
- 14 documents you've seen which might shed some light on
- 15 the Minnesota Medicaid Fraud Control Unit, do you
- 16 have any knowledge of the operation of Medicaid Fraud
- 17 Control Units elsewhere in the United States or
- 18 territories?
- 19 A. I have a general knowledge of how Fraud Control
- 20 Units work. Go ahead.
- 21 Q. Have you --
- 22 Can you point me to a Medicaid Fraud Control
- 23 Unit in any other state or territory that you believe
- 24 functions more effectively in the effort to prevent
- 25 or detect Medicaid fraud and abuse than that in

- 1 Minnesota?
- 2 A. As I say, that's not --
- 3 Sitting here right now, no, I cannot. I will
- 4 continue to study. But no, today I can't do that.
- 5 Q. Do you have any criticism of the extent to which
- 6 the SURS unit and the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit or
- 7 the information systems in Minnesota are budgeted?
- 8 A. Are budgeted.
- 9 Q. Yes. Perhaps that is more murky than I mean for
- 10 it to be.
- 11 When I say "budgeted," I'm asking whether you
- 12 believe that they are adequately funded.
- 13 A. Based upon testimony and documents that I've
- 14 read, I know that there was a period in time, for
- 15 example, when the SURS unit had more staff than they
- 16 have now, for example, and at that time they had a
- 17 level of recovery of X, let's say -- quite a bit of
- 18 that seems to have been a result of some types of
- 19 special projects investigation -- and at a -- in a
- 20 year which I'm not sure I remember, somewhere around
- 21 '93, there was a cutback and the number of staff was
- 22 reduced, the number of special projects was reduced,
- 23 and there was a reduction in the amount of money that
- 24 was recovered. And to my knowledge, they're still
- 25 not back to that level of '93. I mean I see nothing

- 1 to tell me that they are yet. So based on that
- 2 and -- and --
- I have seen documents, for example, that say if
- 4 we had another investigator or two, they would
- 5 bring -- we would recoup -- I don't remember the
- 6 exact numbers as I sit here, but something like
- 7 75,000, I don't remember the exact numbers, more than
- 8 we have now. So from what I've seen so far, it seems
- 9 that there could be greater recoveries if there were
- 10 larger staffs, at least based on historical data.
- 11 Q. You make reference to this change in the SURS
- 12 staffing on the bottom of page 20 and the top of page
- 13 21 of your report.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. I'll ask you to go there for the moment, please.
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. Going first to the first paragraph on 21, what
- 18 was your source for those statistics?
- 19 A. It is a document that shows -- that has charts.
- 20 I have to --
- 21 I don't remember if it was a SURS unit report.
- 22 It is a document that discusses that cutback in
- 23 addition to investigations about personal-care
- 24 attendants. As I sit here, I can't pull up the name
- 25 of the document.

- 1 Q. Okay. Did you read the deposition of Mr.
- 2 McKeever in which the subject of the cutback in his
- 3 staff was discussed?
- 4 A. I read McKeever's deposition, yes.
- 5 Q. And you saw Mr. McKeever's explanation that he
- 6 didn't feel that the effectiveness of his unit was
- 7 altered by that cutback?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: I object to the form. If
- 9 there is specific testimony, counsel, I think in
- 10 fairness it ought to be shown to the witness.
- 11 A. I remember his general deposition. I don't
- 12 remember that statement specifically.
- 13 Q. You don't remember him saying that.
- 14 A. As I sit here, I don't remember that specific
- 15 thing.
- 16 Q. All right. You've stated that you haven't seen
- 17 anything that would lead you to believe that the rate
- 18 of fraud and abuse in Minnesota was any different
- 19 than that projected in some of the national studies
- 20 that you refer to.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. I'm
- 22 sorry.
- 23 Q. Did I understand you correctly about that?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You don't believe that there can be a difference

- 1 between states in the country based upon cultural
- 2 issues and the makeup of the population?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. Do I believe that some states are culturally
- 5 different from other states?
- 6 Q. Correct.
- 7 A. Yes, I believe that's possible.
- 8 Q. Do you believe that that -- those cultural
- 9 differences can sometimes be reflected in the rates
- 10 of fraud and abuse in all aspects of society in those
- 11 states?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. Well I don't know that I would -- I don't know
- 14 that I would agree with that.
- 15 Q. Okay. You don't --
- 16 You disagree that there -- that the cultural
- 17 differences could sometimes be reflected in different
- 18 rates of fraud and abuse in society as a whole?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 20 question.
- 21 A. I don't know that I agree with that statement.
- 22 I mean I --
- 23 Q. So you believe there's just as much fraud and
- 24 abuse in Minneapolis as in Chicago, for example.
- 25 A. Provider fraud and abuse or --

- 1 Q. No.
- 2 A. Are you talking about Medicaid? Are you talking
- 3 about --
- 4 Q. I'm talking about fraud and abuse throughout
- 5 this society, throughout the culture.
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. That's not -- that's not something I even --
- 8 Q. That's nothing you've ever thought about; is
- 9 that what you were going to say?
- 10 A. Well as I sit here, I mean, the question's
- 11 total -- took me totally aback. It's not -- it's not
- 12 something that I've actually sat around and focused
- 13 on, no.
- 14 Q. Okay. Well I think that you can surmise that
- 15 the reason I'm interested in that is that you seem to
- 16 indicate that it is your strongly-held belief that
- 17 Minnesota must be just like the national average with
- 18 respect to fraud and abuse in the Medicaid program,
- 19 and I'm wondering whether that is your opinion also
- 20 with respect to the society as a whole.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 Q. But I understand that you haven't even wrestled
- 23 with that concept one way or the other at this point.
- 24 A. I mean if -- it's not something that --
- MR. LINVILLE: Again I object to the form.

- 1 I don't know where we are now.
- 2 MR. McKENNA: Well you shouldn't --
- 3 Q. Are you finished with your answer?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And basically what you're saying to me is that
- 6 you haven't thought about the differences culturally
- 7 between the states on the subject of fraud and abuse.
- 8 A. I just want to make sure I understand you
- 9 clearly about that. Fraud and abuse in the
- 10 population at large for any reason?
- 11 Q. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 12 A. That simply is not something I sat around and
- 13 pondered, for any amount of time anyway.
- 14 Q. All right. Didn't you think that such an
- 15 inquiry on your part might be necessary before
- 16 concluding that Minnesota would be the same as the
- 17 national average with respect to fraud and abuse as
- 18 you understand the national average to be?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 20 question.
- 21 A. No, because we're looking at fraud and abuse in
- 22 specific programs, --
- 23 Q. All right.
- 24 A. -- not in the --
- 25 Q. Why would that be any different than fraud and

- 1 abuse in the culture as a whole, in society as a
- 2 whole?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 4 question.
- 5 A. The reason I believe it's not different is based
- 6 on the type of information I've been seeing about the
- 7 types of payments that are getting through the
- 8 Minnesota Medicaid system. It has nothing to do with
- 9 the cultural descriptions of the residents.
- 10 Q. What are you talking about, the types of claims
- 11 that you've seen getting through the system?
- 12 A. The numbers or the --
- I mean I have seen reports to -- for example, to
- 14 say that in 1993 we collected X amount of stuff -- or
- 15 dollars, recoveries, when we had a greater staff; now
- 16 we don't. Or I don't -- qualify "now." I have to go
- 17 back and look at the years. I know that there was a
- 18 reduction in staff. I know that there was a
- 19 reduction in the recovery. I know that there are
- 20 statements in documents that I have read about the
- 21 fact that there is much fraud in the health-care
- 22 system in Minnesota.
- 23 Q. What sources are you referring to that say there
- 24 is much fraud in the health-care systems in
- 25 Minnesota?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 Q. I mean not those national studies that you
- 3 referred to in Appendix II-B. None of them addresses
- 4 Minnesota; does it?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Well what studies are you referring to?
- 7 A. I didn't say a study.
- 8 Q. Well what documents are you referring to?
- 9 A. One of the documents --
- 10 There is a document that I do reference in here
- 11 that talks about the lack of doing provider audits,
- 12 on-site audits, for example, nursing home audits, if
- 13 I remember correctly.
- 14 Q. You know that that document is not something
- 15 that opines that Minnesota has much fraud and abuse
- 16 in it; don't you?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. The document in one of -- there is a document,
- 19 for example --
- 20 Well let me back up and answer what I started to
- 21 first. The document that I was referring to, and
- 22 here it says it's a 1996 Medicaid Fraud Control Unit
- 23 Strike Force report, states that for every 20 dollars
- 24 spent on investigative audits of nursing homes, 190
- 25 dollars was disallowed. Now --

- 1 Q. And from this you drew the conclusion that
- 2 Minnesota was just like all other states in
- 3 connection with the rate of fraud and abuse in the
- 4 Medicaid program.
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 Q. Is that what you're telling me?
- 7 A. I'm saying that's one of many things I've looked
- 8 at that has not yet convinced me that it's any less.
- 9 Q. Okay. So it's not --
- 10 What you're telling me is it's not a matter of
- 11 you being persuaded it's like other states, you just
- 12 haven't been persuaded that it's not; is that what
- 13 you're saying?
- 14 A. From what I have seen, there are many different
- 15 types of claims --
- 16 Q. Why don't you read the question before you
- 17 continue.
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: I object to interrupting the
- 19 witness before she's even had a chance to answer the
- 20 question.
- 21 MR. McKENNA: Well this witness routinely
- 22 takes a full minute before beginning her answer to my
- 23 question. This witness has persistently not answered
- 24 the question that I've asked her. We are now running
- 25 short of time and I'm entitled to push this thing

- 1 along, if necessary, by interrupting this witness to
- 2 get us on track.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: I -- I don't agree with
- 4 that, counsel. I don't think you're entitled to
- 5 interrupt the witness before she's had a chance to --
- 6 First of all, I don't know whether -- how you
- 7 can know whether her answer is reponsive until you
- 8 hear it.
- 9 Q. While we were talking, did you have a chance to
- 10 reread the question?
- 11 A. It's scrolling.
- 12 Q. I see.
- MR. McKENNA: Mr. Reporter, would you read
- 14 the question, please.
- 15 (Record read by the court reporter.)
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 17 A. What I'm trying to tell you, and I have been
- 18 consistently trying to tell you, is that based on
- 19 testimony and documents that I have read, I believe
- 20 the amount is substantial. Now I've been asked to
- 21 give a percentage or an estimate, and so I have said
- 22 to you I know these national estimates are out
- 23 there. We see it repeatedly, not from one source but
- 24 many different sources. And so I have chosen to say
- 25 to you that as of this moment I have nothing to tell

- 1 me that I think Minnesota is less than that. But I
- 2 am repeatedly seeing, which I'm still going through
- 3 and I'm still looking at, all these instances of
- 4 payments that have been made inappropriately, so I've
- 5 seen nothing to convince me that they are not a
- 6 substantial amount, a very large amount of claims
- 7 that are being paid inappropriately.
- 8 Q. Do you know as an attorney something called a
- 9 concept of the burden of proof?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And you understand that the burden in civil
- 12 litigation upon the proponent of a particular
- 13 proposition is that they must prove it, not that
- 14 someone else must disprove it?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 Q. Do you understand that?
- 17 A. I understand that.
- 18 Q. Okay. Did you not think it was your
- 19 responsibility to prove your opinions, not for
- 20 someone else to disprove them?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. I am still studying on my own the documents to
- 23 see, and I -- as I read, the more I read, I continue
- 24 to see the number of inappropriate payments that have
- 25 been paid in Minnesota.

- 1 Q. Did you not think it was your responsibility to
- 2 prove your opinions rather than someone else
- 3 disproving them? You keep saying --
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object. Object to the form.
- 5 Q. You keep saying that you haven't seen anything
- 6 to convince you otherwise. I'm asking: Don't you
- 7 understand that it's your responsibility to convince
- 8 the jury in this case, not the other way around?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 10 question.
- 11 A. You have continued to press me for a percentage.
- 12 Q. Yes, I have.
- 13 A. And I chose that percentage to try to explain to
- 14 you what is believed is out there. But I am
- 15 continuing to try to decipher from what I have to
- 16 look at, and it's voluminous, what is there. I know
- 17 it's substantial. But if you're going to push me for
- 18 a percentage, I explained to you why that's a
- 19 percentage that I chose. But I'm not -- I'm -- I'm
- 20 still -- I'm still looking at this.
- 21 Q. Okay. So you haven't come to the opinion yet as
- 22 to what percentage there is, except for the fact that
- 23 there are supposed national studies that use the 10
- 24 percent figure, and you haven't seen anything yet to
- 25 persuade you otherwise in connection with Minnesota.

- 1 Is that a fair statement?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. It's a fair statement that I really am not sure
- 4 what the amount is.
- 5 Q. All right.
- 6 A. And it's --
- 7 I'm still looking at it.
- 8 Q. Okay. Now do you know, just as a -- as a lawyer
- 9 and a citizen of this country, that there are
- 10 different crime rates between the different states of
- 11 this union?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And that those different crime rates between the
- 14 states are often statistically quite significantly
- 15 different?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And do you not believe that the general rate of
- 18 crime statistics showing the differential in the
- 19 states indicates that there may very well and
- 20 probably is a big difference in the rate of fraud and
- 21 abuse in those societies as well?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 Q. Or is this another aspect of this that you just
- 24 haven't come around to thinking about yet?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. We are talking about a very large --
- 2 A very large part of what we are talking about
- 3 looking at here deals with doctors and other
- 4 professional providers, and I'm not sure that, in my
- 5 mind anyway, that a location, geographical location
- 6 makes differences in a professional's behavior.
- 7 Q. Okay. Are you prepared to conclude that it does
- 8 not make a difference?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 10 A. I've not made that conclusion. I have -- but --
- 11 Q. Fair enough. So you are --
- 12 You at this juncture still have an open mind on
- 13 the issue of whether or not Minnesota's fraud and
- 14 abuse rate is the same as these national averages.
- 15 Is that a fair statement?
- 16 A. I have not made a final determination. I have
- 17 not done that, that's correct.
- 18 Q. Excellent.
- 19 I want to explore a little further with you this
- 20 10 percent figure that you refer to in the national
- 21 studies. Which national studies or experts or
- 22 sources use that 10 percent figure?
- 23 A. Oh, gee. Well I quoted an OIG study that
- 24 gives -- it's between 13 and 14 percent.
- 25 Q. You quoted an OIG study which you have not

- 1 referred to in your report --
- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q. -- in violation of the court's order; is that
- 4 what you're saying?
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 Q. Is that right?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. I did quote it.
- 9 Q. And it's not in your report.
- 10 A. I think that's correct, because I just became --
- 11 became aware of it.
- 12 Q. Okay. And what other national studies?
- 13 A. You see reports from the FBI, for example.
- 14 Q. Are any of those included in your report?
- 15 A. No. And I didn't include them in the report
- 16 because it's such a general figure that's out there.
- 17 I mean it's not -- it's -- it's like -- it's
- 18 almost --
- 19 Q. Well didn't you think that we were entitled to
- 20 examine the sources of your opinion? And how could
- 21 we do that if you didn't disclose them?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. That is a -- a figure that has been in national
- 24 headlines all across the country for ages.
- 25 Q. Did you not believe that, in connection with

- 1 offering your opinion in this case, that we were
- 2 entitled to examine the sources of your opinion?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I felt that it was such a universally known
- 5 figure that I did not include it. I did not include
- 6 sources. I'm not saying they all say that, but a lot
- 7 do.
- 8 Q. All right. So in addition to the OIG study that
- 9 you didn't disclose, you now are referring to some
- 10 FBI studies that you haven't disclosed. What other
- 11 studies?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 Q. What other studies are you relying upon in
- 14 putting forth this 10 percent figure?
- 15 A. I'm relying upon a body of newspapers,
- 16 magazines. I mean it's not something that's
- 17 difficult to find.
- 18 Q. All right. And do any of the studies, the
- 19 documents that you have alluded to in exhibit II-B of
- 20 your report, set forth the 10 percent figure that
- 21 you're referring to?
- 22 A. Some of them --
- I can't remember exactly which ones, but, for
- 24 example, the testimony before Cohen's committee.
- 25 Q. Testimony by whom?

- 1 A. I don't remember. I have to go back and look at
- 2 it.
- 3 Q. Which number in your references is that?
- 4 A. It's number one. But I have to go back and look
- 5 at the report. But that was -- that was one of
- 6 the -- the --
- 7 I'd have to go back and look at it.
- 8 Q. Well let me see if I can't give it to you to
- 9 look at. Find it in there (document handed to the
- 10 witness) for me, will you?
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Excuse me. May I just
- 12 review that for a second?
- Counsel, are you going to mark this, or is this
- 14 just a --
- MR. McKENNA: Well I -- I would prefer to
- 16 have her just look at it since it's a library book
- 17 which I have not bothered to copy. If you're
- 18 agreeable to that procedure, I'd appreciate it. If
- 19 not, we'll find some way to cope with this. Maybe we
- 20 can save time.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: I noticed on the front page
- 22 here that this has a date of March 21st, 1995, and
- 23 item one on her list has a date of July 2nd, 1994.
- MR. McKENNA: Let me --
- MR. LINVILLE: Now that date was covered up

- 1 here the way you presented it to us, but --
- 2 MR. McKENNA: Let me have a look.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: -- this may not be quite the
- 4 same document.
- 5 MR. McKENNA: It may not be. Give me a
- 6 moment.
- 7 Yeah. What I tabbed with Post-It note,
- 8 manufactured by 3M, a leading Minnesota company, is
- 9 exactly the document that she referred to as number
- 10 one.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: I'm sorry, I obviously
- 12 didn't have a chance to look through it all,
- 13 counsel.
- MR. McKENNA: Okay. Well it isn't a
- 15 lengthy document.
- 16 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 17 Q. But you're saying that the 10 percent number is
- 18 in here.
- 19 A. I'm not sure it's in there. It's not a number I
- 20 made up.
- 21 Q. I didn't say that. I don't know whether you did
- 22 or not, but I'm not accusing you of that. I just
- 23 want --
- 24 If you didn't make it up, where did it come
- 25 from? That's what I want to know.

- 1 A. It came from many different sources. I --
- 2 Q. Yeah. Are any of these sources on Appendix II-B
- 3 documents which state the 10 percent figure that
- 4 you're talking about?
- 5 A. I would have to go back and look at the
- 6 documents.
- 7 Q. Okay. All right. Now on page 18 of your report
- 8 you not only say 10 percent, but you quote, quote,
- 9 knowledgeable observers, end of quote, to the effect
- 10 that it's 10 to 20 percent. Now where is the 20
- 11 percent figure spelled out? Which national observers
- 12 and which knowledgeable observers?
- 13 A. Again I would have to go back and look at these
- 14 documents to identify.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 A. Again, it's not a figure that I made up.
- 17 Q. Well I want to know where it came from.
- 18 Don't --
- 19 Do you not believe that I'm entitled to know
- 20 where it came from?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. I'm not denying your right to know.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. I simply assumed it was so universally known
- 25 that it --

- 1 Q. I just want to make it clear that counsel did
- 2 not tell you that you weren't to disclose as a part
- 3 of your report all matters -- excuse me, a listing of
- 4 all principal treatises or articles or documents
- 5 relied upon by the expert in support of his or her
- 6 opinion, you weren't told that you were supposed to
- 7 list those things?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- A. In the first place, I am not sure it's not in
- 10 any of those, I have to go back and look at them; and
- 11 in the second place, this was something that I
- 12 considered to be common knowledge in the literature
- 13 in the community.
- 14 Q. Do you believe it's possible for any state
- 15 Medicaid fraud -- excuse me, any state Medicaid
- 16 program to eliminate fraud and abuse? Is that
- 17 possible?
- 18 A. I'm not sure that's possible, no.
- 19 Q. Now one of the things that you are critical of
- 20 in your report is that the state did not meet a
- 21 statutory requirement that 25 percent of nursing
- 22 homes and group homes be subject to a field audit
- 23 annually; is that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Could you just refer us to
- 25 where you're reading, counsel?

- 1 MR. McKENNA: Sure. Page 19, second full
- 2 paragraph.
- 3 A. Page 19?
- 4 Q. Page 19.
- 5 A. Okay.
- 6 Q. There is a partial paragraph at the top of some
- 7 seven or eight lines, but the second full --
- 8 A. Right. The "Documents" -- beginning with the
- 9 word "Documents...?"
- 10 Q. No, that's the first full paragraph.
- 11 A. "Notwithstanding...?"
- 12 Q. Correct.
- 13 A. Okay.
- 14 MR. LINVILLE: I will object to the form of
- 15 that question.
- 16 (Discussion off the record.)
- 17 Q. Good grief. Let me ask the question again.
- 18 Are you not critical on page 19 in your report
- 19 of the state for not conducting an annual audit of 25
- 20 percent of the nursing homes and group homes, an
- 21 annual field audit? Isn't that a criticism that you
- 22 make?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. That's a statement, yes, showing that they were
- 25 in violation of the statute.
  - STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
    P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Q. Well I mean are you --
- 2 I asked you if it's a criticism, and you say
- 3 it's a statement. Are you saying it's not a
- 4 criticism?
- 5 A. Statement of fact.
- 6 Q. And you don't mean for it to be critical?
- 7 A. It's part of the analysis. This is a fact that
- 8 this is what happened.
- 9 Q. Well --
- 10 A. They did not meet statutory requirements.
- 11 Q. Okay. But as far as --
- 12 Are you saying that's okay or that that's good
- 13 or bad or what?
- 14 A. I am saying that as a result -- as a result of
- 15 that, things happen like I discussed in the paragraph
- 16 above, which is 20 dollars being spent on
- 17 investigative audits of nursing homes, 190 dollars'
- 18 worth were disallowed. I mean it shows that there --
- 19 there was a return on investment of auditing.
- 20 Q. If you are not critical of the state for failing
- 21 to do those audits, just say so and we'll move on to
- 22 another subject.
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I believe that the state was in violation of the
- 25 statute.

- 1 Q. Is that a criticism?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 Q. This is impossible. Are you not suggesting that
- 4 there is some failure on the part of the state to act
- 5 appropriately in detecting and preventing fraud and
- 6 abuse arising from their failure to do a field audit
- 7 on an annual basis of 25 percent of the nursing homes
- 8 and group homes? Because if you're not being
- 9 critical of them for that, then we'll just go
- 10 somewhere else for another subject.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 MR. McKENNA: Well Mr. Linville, I -- I
- 13 object to the way this is proceeding. This is
- 14 assuming the dimensions of an intentional stall.
- 15 This is ridiculous. Either this is intended to be a
- 16 criticism of the state or it's not, and for -- for us
- 17 to -- to spend all this time thinking about the
- 18 question of whether it is or isn't a criticism is a
- 19 delaying tactic which I think is quite inappropriate,
- 20 and I believe it entitles us to additional deposition
- 21 time if this is what's going to be happening, and it
- 22 has been happening.
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Well I strongly object to
- 24 what you say, counsel, and I think the record will be
- 25 very clear what's happening here. And I think the

- 1 record should speak for itself and I -- I don't want
- 2 to get involved in speech-making that will eat up the
- 3 time here. Let's go on with the deposition.
- 4 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 5 Q. Ms. Overall, were you attempting to be critical
- 6 of the state in that paragraph, or weren't you?
- 7 A. I was attempting to show one way in which
- 8 there's a possibility that fraudulent or improper
- 9 payments were not being recovered.
- 10 Q. And that's a criticism of the state.
- 11 A. If you want to look at it that way. I mean
- 12 it's -- it's saying what it says.
- 13 Q. Well are you suggesting that -- that it's okay,
- 14 that somehow the effort to detect and prevent fraud
- 15 and abuse was set back by their failure to do these
- 16 audits?
- 17 A. I'm saying that there's a possibility that there
- 18 was money out there to be recovered that was not
- 19 recovered as a result of not doing the audits.
- 20 Q. Why is it that you are reluctant to characterize
- 21 that as the criticism which it obviously is?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. What I'm trying to do here is say here's what
- 24 happened, not to give a plus or minus or good or bad
- 25 interpretation. But I mean this is what happened.

- 1 Q. You draw the final conclusion on page 21 with
- 2 respect to this review of the overall subject of
- 3 fraud and abuse detection and enforcement efforts in
- 4 Minnesota that a substantial amount of fraud and
- 5 abuse goes on undetected in the Minnesota Medicaid
- 6 and other state programs; correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. And isn't the foregoing analysis an effort on
- 9 your part to suggest that the state has not acted
- 10 appropriately or reasonably in their efforts to
- 11 detect fraud and abuse in the Medicaid program?
- 12 A. I'm trying to say to you that I have tried to
- 13 outline factually what has happened and not to give a
- 14 report card.
- 15 Q. All right. Then I'll ask you: What are your
- 16 criticisms of the efforts of the Minnesota Medicaid
- 17 system to detect and prevent fraud and abuse in the
- 18 Medicaid program? What have they done wrong?
- 19 A. There's a whole series of factors that have
- 20 contributed to not collecting inappropriate payments.
- 21 Q. Let's hear them.
- 22 A. There is the fact that there's a -- that claims
- 23 go through the -- the computer system with edits in
- 24 place that are not caught for being inappropriate
- 25 payments.

- 1 Q. Okay.
- 2 A. There seem to be different reasons for that, but
- 3 that's a major category --
- 4 Q. Okay.
- 5 A. -- both for providers and enrollees, --
- 6 Q. All right.
- 7 A. -- beneficiaries, whatever you want to call
- 8 them.
- 9 There seems to have been -- there was, there
- 10 didn't seem to be, there was a cutback in staff at
- 11 one point in the SURS unit, for example, that --
- 12 according to the report I read, which shows resulted
- 13 in fewer recoveries.
- 14 Q. All right.
- 15 A. There are --
- As I've quoted before, there are, by their own
- 17 statements in budget requests -- and I'll have to go
- 18 back and look to see if it was a fraud unit or the
- 19 SURS unit now -- stating that if they had more
- 20 investigators, it would be cost effective. And it
- 21 gave a figure. I do not remember the figure off the
- 22 top of my head. But there is the statement that they
- 23 were in --
- You're right, there's a statement in there that
- 25 they were in -- not in compliance with the statute.

- 1 But --
- 2 Q. No, I'm asking you for your criticisms, I am not
- 3 asking you what statements there are. I want to know
- 4 what are your criticisms of them.
- 5 So we've got -- we got three now. What are the
- 6 rest?
- 7 A. Those are my major ones, but I'm still
- 8 reading. I mean I'm still reading, but what I'm
- 9 seeing is there is a -- there's an enormous amount of
- 10 payments made that shouldn't have been.
- 11 O. All right. What I --
- 12 What I'm interested in exploring with you is
- 13 the -- and I can't believe this is not clear, but
- 14 I'll try to make it more clear. The fact that there
- 15 is some fraud and abuse is not something that is
- 16 disputed here. What I want to know is what are your
- 17 criticisms of the efforts of Minnesota to detect and
- 18 prevent fraud and abuse. Because if their efforts
- 19 are up to snuff and there is still fraud and abuse,
- 20 it's not their fault; isn't that the case?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. I don't believe that I have ever said anything
- 23 was anybody's fault.
- 24 Q. Well --
- 25 A. That's not what -- that's not what I've been

- 1 asked to do.
- 2 Q. All right. Is it --
- 3 Would you agree with me that in any system
- 4 involving the payment of money for medical care,
- 5 there will be some fraud and abuse which cannot be
- 6 detected?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 Q. You told me a few minutes ago that you thought
- 9 that it's unlikely that fraud and abuse could be
- 10 eliminated in the system. Isn't that the same thing
- 11 as what I've just asked you?
- 12 A. If that's the same thing you just asked me, then
- 13 I agree.
- 14 Q. All right. So now refer your attention, please,
- 15 to page -- the bottom of page three and the top of
- 16 page four of your report. Do you see there where you
- 17 offer up the opinion that the plaintiffs' principal
- 18 damage experts in their report make no mention of the
- 19 possibility that fraud and abuse may have inflated
- 20 inappropriately the health-care expenditures that
- 21 form the basis for plaintiffs' damages calculations?
- 22 Do you see what I'm talking about?
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 THE REPORTER: Your answer?
- MR. McKENNA: "Yes?"

- 1 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm sorry.
- 2 Q. Now you understand that one of the issues that
- 3 is critical in this case is whether or not Minnesota
- 4 was doing -- expending the level of effective effort
- 5 that was reasonably expected of them to detect and
- 6 prevent fraud and abuse; correct?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. No one has ever said that to me before like
- 9 that, so --
- 10 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 11 A. So that is your --
- I mean I'll accept that as your statement.
- 13 Q. So in your analysis of this, what you're saying
- 14 to me is that you have not come to any conclusion
- 15 about whether or not Minnesota has been expending a
- 16 reasonable degree of effective effort to detect and
- 17 prevent fraud and abuse in the Medicaid program.
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 Q. That's what you meant when you said you didn't
- 20 have a report card for anybody.
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. What I'm trying to tell you is I am still -- I
- 23 am still going through documents, I am still going
- 24 through testimony, I mean I'm still doing that and I
- 25 will continue to do that as long as I keep getting

- 1 documents. And --
- 2 Q. But as of right now you have not come to a
- 3 conclusion one way or the other as to whether
- 4 Minnesota has expended a reasonable degree of
- 5 effective effort to detect and prevent Medicaid fraud
- 6 and abuse.
- 7 A. As of this moment I'm still studying. What I've
- 8 seen is that there's an awful lot inappropriate
- 9 payments going out. But I am still studying that,
- 10 Mr. McKenna.
- MR. McKENNA: Read the question back, Mr.
- 12 Reporter, please.
- 13 (Record read by the court reporter.)
- 14 A. What I have been looking at is what's happening,
- 15 factually what's happening, not to make a decision on
- 16 whether it's a reasonable expenditure of resources,
- 17 et cetera. What I have been looking at is: Is there
- 18 fraud and abuse there? And how is it happening?
- 19 That's what I've been doing.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, when you -- when
- 21 you come to a breaking point, we're at about an hour.
- 22 Q. I'm prepared to keep asking the question until
- 23 you answer it. Do you have an opinion as to whether
- 24 Minnesota has been reasonable in this effort or not?
- 25 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 Q. If you don't have that opinion, fine, say you
- 2 don't have it.
- 3 A. I'm still formulating my opinion.
- 4 Q. You don't have one now.
- 5 A. No, not a final one.
- 6 Q. Then what is your preliminary one?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. The preliminary one is what I've been saying
- 9 over and over again. I'm seeing that there are large
- 10 amounts of inappropriate payments being made by the
- 11 Medicaid system.
- 12 Q. Okay. And you know, don't you, that is not the
- 13 same as saying Minnesota hasn't expended reasonable
- 14 efforts. The fact that there is what you
- 15 characterize a large amount is not the same as saying
- 16 that Minnesota has been unreasonable in its efforts.
- 17 You know that; don't you?
- 18 A. I'm not prepared to say to you Minnesota is
- 19 reasonable or unreasonable.
- 20 MR. McKENNA: Okay. Why don't we take a
- 21 break now.
- 22 MR. LINVILLE: Okav.
- 23 (Recess taken.)
- 24 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 25 Q. Please direct your attention to page 14 of your

- 1 report.
- 2 A. Okay.
- 3 Q. On the fifth line down of the second full
- 4 paragraph, beginning with the word "Rather...," do
- 5 you find that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. "Rather, if a correct provider number,
- 8 beneficiary number, procedure code and other relevant
- 9 codes are entered on a submitted bill, Medicaid will
- 10 pay the claim without examination." Do you see that?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Is that your opinion with respect to the
- 13 Minnesota Medicaid program?
- 14 A. Yes, generally. Unless they've put some type of
- 15 prepay or something, that's generally what happens.
- 16 Q. Well do you not know that there is this
- 17 extensive computer system with some nearly 1,000
- 18 edits which examines many aspects of such programs?
- 19 A. That's not what I'm talking about.
- 20 Q. Well you say they pay without examination. You
- 21 don't call that an examination?
- 22 A. No, I --
- Let me clarify something here. When I use the
- 24 term -- when I have used the term "prepayment
- 25 review," I'm not talking about -- I'm talking about

- 1 an additional prepayment review that -- that we
- 2 talked about earlier, I'm not talking about the
- 3 computer system and edits when I use that term.
- 4 Q. And I don't know that I am either here because
- 5 you used the phrase "without examination." You don't
- 6 consider this computer analysis to be an examination?
- 7 A. You have to read the entire sentence.
- 8 Q. I did read the entire sentence.
- 9 A. Okay? All right. It says that if you have a
- 10 correct provider number, a correct beneficiary
- 11 number, assuming that the procedure codes and other
- 12 relevant codes that are entered match, there will be
- 13 no further examination.
- 14 Q. And you don't think there's --
- 15 Sorry. Is it that you don't consider this
- 16 analysis by the computer containing some 997 edits to
- 17 be a further examination?
- 18 A. I consider that when a claim comes in and it
- 19 goes through the computer system and the computer
- 20 system checks for all the relevant data, it is
- 21 looking at it to see if there is a valid provider
- 22 code, if there's a valid recipient or beneficiary
- 23 code, if there's a valid diagnosis, if there's a
- 24 valid procedure, and if all of that matches and
- 25 doesn't --

- 1 What I'm trying to say here is the same thing we
- 2 talked about earlier. If all that goes through, the
- 3 claim is paid. If something was medically
- 4 unnecessary, the computer couldn't pick it up.
- 5 Q. All I want to know is: Don't you consider that
- 6 the 997 edits that the computer system applies to
- 7 this to be a further examination? Obviously that's
- 8 much more than the provider number, beneficiary
- 9 number, procedure code.
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: And other relevant codes.
- 11 Q. Other 995 relevant codes. Is that what you're
- 12 saying? I mean what I want to know is you seem to be
- 13 implying here that nothing goes on except for an
- 14 examination as to whether there is a provider number,
- 15 a beneficiary number, a procedure code and then
- 16 other, as you put it, mysterious relevant codes.
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. All right. Even assuming a thousand edits,
- 19 however many you want to assume, --
- 20 Q. Yes.
- 21 A. -- as long as what's on the claim form
- 22 doesn't --
- 23 There are several -- let me -- there are several
- 24 things going on. The computer is originally looking
- 25 for numbers. Now there are some -- there may be some

- 1 edits -- there are edits, let me rephrase that, but
- 2 quite often those edits are not going to kick out
- 3 something -- they would -- obviously they would kick
- 4 out if there's something wrong with the provider
- 5 number, they would kick out something if it was a
- 6 mastectomy for you, for example. Those types of
- 7 edits are in place and they work for the most part
- 8 that I have seen. I'm not denying that, I'm not
- 9 saying that doesn't happen and that that doesn't
- 10 work. But if there are -- if, for example, the
- 11 problem is over-utilization, then guite often the
- 12 over-utilization has to already have happened before
- 13 you figured it out, which means a claim was already
- 14 paid. Now you may go back and edit later, but you
- 15 don't -- quite often that's not done thinking about
- 16 it ahead of time.
- 17 Q. You better keep reading. You conclude that
- 18 paragraph --
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form,
- 20 counsel.
- 21 Q. You conclude that paragraph with saying
- 22 that "one can analogize the Medicaid payment system
- 23 to a very large automatic teller machine that will
- 24 dispense money to health care providers if the proper
- 25 code numbers are entered on a bill." Is that --

- 1 First of all, was that "very large automatic
- 2 teller machine, " was that your language or something
- 3 that the lawyers put in this report?
- 4 A. I believe that --
- 5 Q. Was that your language --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- or something the lawyers put in this report?
- 8 A. It's my language.
- 9 Q. And were you attempting to inject some levity
- 10 here, or were you seriously trying to analogize this
- 11 to a very large automatic teller machine?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. It is an analogy based on what you just read.
- 14 If you have the right number, if you have the right
- 15 provider number, you have the right recipient number,
- 16 you have the right procedure code, you have all the
- 17 codes that are right, and you put it in here, so to
- 18 speak --
- 19 Q. And the money comes out.
- 20 A. And the money comes out.
- 21 Q. So do you believe that there is any way in which
- 22 the computer compares the present claim to other
- 23 claims for that beneficiary or that provider before a
- 24 payment is authorized?
- 25 A. If there's an edit in place that tells the

- 1 computer to do so.
- 2 Q. Do you know whether there is or isn't?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I know that claims are going through and being
- 5 paid when they shouldn't be, so there are not edits
- 6 there that will stop everything.
- 7 Q. Would you look again at the question and answer
- 8 it, please?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 10 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 11 A. There are edits in place that tell the computers
- 12 to kick out a lot of different things. I'm convinced
- 13 of that, yes.
- 14 Q. But you don't know whether or not there are
- 15 edits in place that cause this particular claim to be
- 16 compared to other claims from the same provider or
- 17 the same beneficiary.
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 19 question.
- 20 Q. Is that right?
- 21 A. Unless someone has told the computer to identify
- 22 a particular person, provider or beneficiary, or
- 23 unless you're looking at one of these reports that
- 24 compares utilization, for example, with other
- 25 providers and kicks out on standard deviation from

- 1 some mean, I mean you can -- there are edits like
- 2 that that exist.
- 3 Q. And my question is: Do you know whether or not
- 4 there are edits like that in the Minnesota Medicaid
- 5 system? If you don't know, just say so and we'll
- 6 move on to another subject.
- 7 A. I have read testimony that talks about looking
- 8 at providers' either number of services provided or
- 9 dollars provided or -- I believe they listed another
- 10 category. I don't remember. I --
- I have read language in some of this material I
- 12 have read that talks about the reports that look at
- 13 standard deviations, for example, for outliers.
- 14 Q. So you don't know whether or not there is a
- 15 report that compares this provider's other claims or
- 16 this beneficiary's other claims with the instant
- 17 claim.
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 A. I know that they have reports that compare --
- 20 I know they generate reports that show here are
- 21 all the providers in this particular class and here
- 22 is the services they provided, and they look at -- or
- 23 dollars that they have been paid, and they look for
- 24 outliers.
- 25 Q. Why won't you answer my question?

- 1 A. I'm trying to answer your question.
- 2 Q. Is your answer "Yes," that there is such an
- 3 audit, --
- 4 A. That --
- 5 Q. -- or is it "No, I don't know?"
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: "Such an audit" was your
- 7 question?
- 8 MR. McKENNA: Edit.
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Edit. Your question --
- 10 prior question didn't talk about edits.
- 11 Q. Let me go back to the question that started this
- 12 particular circular exercise. Do you know whether or
- 13 not, when a provider submits a claim in the Medicaid
- 14 system, whether or not the computer compares that
- 15 claim with other claims by the same provider and
- 16 other claims by the same recipient?
- 17 A. I did not understand your question the first
- 18 time you asked it, so let me make sure I understand
- 19 it now. Are you asking me if the computer checks all
- 20 the claims that Provider X submits for Recipient B?
- 21 Q. No. My question is even broader than that. Do
- 22 you know whether the computer checks the instant
- 23 claim with all other claims by that provider and all
- 24 other claims by the same beneficiary?
- 25 A. But not in relation to each other.

- 1 Q. Including in relation to each other. Do you
- 2 know?
- 3 A. I don't remember sitting here now whether
- 4 that --
- 5 Q. Well you --
- 6 A. -- is a pre-programmed audit or not. I'd have
- 7 to go back and look.
- 8 Q. All right. Now you said in this paragraph that
- 9 basically if you stick in a form with a few things
- 10 correct on it, you get money out, and I'd like for
- 11 you to tell me what other relevant codes you are
- 12 referring to in this paragraph when you say if a
- 13 correct provider number, beneficiary number,
- 14 procedure code and other relevant codes are entered
- 15 on a submitted bill, Medicaid will pay the claim
- 16 without examination. What are the other relevant
- 17 codes that you are referring to?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 A. Well there are several codes, as you know, on a
- 20 claim form. Yes, there must be a correct provider
- 21 number, yes, there must be a correct beneficiary,
- 22 there must be a procedure code, there are other codes
- 23 such as place of service on some of them, the date of
- 24 service. I mean it's -- it's -- it's almost
- 25 demographic data. But I mean, for example, it may be

- 1 later on you discover that there is a bill for a
- 2 service provided when the -- on that date that person
- 3 wasn't even at the provider's office.
- 4 Q. No. My question is what are the other relevant
- 5 codes that are on the form that produce the
- 6 phenomenon analogous to the automatic teller
- 7 machine. Now you say that other relevant codes --
- 8 that if there's a correct provider number,
- 9 beneficiary number, procedure code and other relevant
- 10 codes on it, that it gets paid, and I want to know
- 11 what the other relevant codes are. Because you
- 12 are -- you're the one that's saying this thing spits
- 13 out money as if you were just putting in a credit
- 14 card, and I want to know what other relevant codes
- 15 will trigger that process. Because I think you've
- 16 grossly oversimplified this, and I want you to
- 17 explain it.
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Objection.
- 19 A. What the computer do -- is doing is matching
- 20 what it has been programmed to do with what comes
- 21 into the system.
- 22 Q. Yes.
- 23 A. And as long as a computer reads a claim form,
- 24 that everything on there is filled out correctly,
- 25 everything, including other codes like -- many claim

- 1 forms do require place of service, and that is a
- 2 code -- you may have a diagnosis code, but my -- the
- 3 point I'm trying to make is if a provider matches all
- 4 of these numbers with -- if what -- what goes in all
- 5 these boxes on the claims contains data that
- 6 corresponds to what appears to be a valid -- a
- 7 valid -- all these things I've named, then without --
- 8 unless that claim does something to trigger an edit,
- 9 it won't be spit out, it won't be kicked out.
- 10 Q. Have you finished your explanation of what the
- 11 other relevant codes are that you say will trigger
- 12 this payment?
- 13 A. Yes. I'm sure there are more, but at the moment
- 14 I don't --
- 15 Q. Well now is it your testimony that the computer
- 16 looks at what's within the four corners, so to speak,
- 17 of the particular claim, and if that's all in order,
- 18 it pays it?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. There are instances when it don't -- "when it
- 21 don't" -- when it doesn't.
- 22 Q. And those --
- 23 A. But that's when it's been programmed not to.
- 24 Q. Well, and that's what I'm trying to explore.
- 25 You seem to be implying in this paragraph that there

- 1 are very few, simple things that have to be put on a
- 2 form, and if these are all in order, it gets paid
- 3 without examination, and I'm trying to explore what
- 4 your understanding is of the degree of sophistication
- 5 of this computer system in the review of that claim
- 6 and other data before the claim is paid. And if --
- 7 and if you don't have any more information, fine,
- 8 let's get to that point. But you've --
- 9 You're the one who makes the statement here that
- 10 a very few things on the form will generate a
- 11 payment, and I want to know whether you have any
- 12 knowledge that it's more sophisticated than that.
- MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, that's not the
- 14 statement she makes. Let's move on to the next
- 15 question.
- MR. McKENNA: Of course it's the statement
- 17 she makes; it's right there in black and white. You
- 18 probably wrote it.
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, that's way out of
- 20 order.
- 21 Q. When do you think these 997 audits of this --
- 22 edits of this computer system take hold? After the
- 23 payment?
- 24 A. I am not saying that there are not edits in
- 25 place.

- 1 Q. Would you answer that question? When do you
- 2 think those edits take place? After the payment or
- 3 before?
- 4 A. There are edits in place to check before a claim
- 5 is paid. I don't dispute that.
- 6 Q. And there are hundreds of them; aren't there?
- 7 A. To my knowledge, yes.
- 8 Q. Do you have any reason to dispute my
- 9 representation to you that there are 997?
- 10 A. No. There are hundreds, I agree with that.
- 11 Q. Not just a few as you imply in this paragraph.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. I don't disagree. I'm not --
- 14 Q. Have you studied the list of edits so that you
- 15 have some idea of what kinds of things are kicked out
- 16 by the computer?
- 17 A. I know the computer will pick up discrepancies
- 18 like in -- for example, if none of this matches,
- 19 if -- the example I already gave you, if the -- if
- 20 it's a procedure, for example, that should be ObGyn
- 21 and it's for a man, obviously it's wrong, it will be
- 22 kicked out. If it's --
- There are a lot of edits that will kick it out.
- 24 I'm not saying there are not edits that will kick it
- 25 out.

- 1 Q. Well --
- 2 A. But if you -- go ahead.
- 3 Q. -- ma'am, I suggest that you are saying that.
- 4 Now would you agree with me that analogizing
- 5 this system with this complicated computer system of
- 6 analyzing these claims and other data before the
- 7 claim is paid, that that's several orders of
- 8 magnitude more complex than an automated teller
- 9 machine?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. I don't dispute that there are more edits in
- 12 place than there are in something like a teller
- 13 machine.
- 14 Q. Would you agree with me that it's misleading to
- 15 analogize it to an automated teller machine?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 17 A. No, I will not, I will not agree with you.
- 18 Q. All right. Let me explore what your experience
- 19 is with an automated teller machine. What I
- 20 understand you to be referring to is the sort of
- 21 system where, if I've got a credit card and I punch
- 22 in it and I am able to put in a PIN or a personal
- 23 identification number and tell it how much money I
- 24 want, it gives me money; right?
- 25 A. Right.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 Q. And that's the kind of automated teller machine
- 3 system that you're talking about; correct?
- 4 A. Yes. I'm talking about a system -- a system in
- 5 which, if you can match the numbers, you will be
- 6 paid.
- 7 Q. Well this statement here doesn't say anything
- 8 about a claim which has to pass 997 computerized
- 9 edits before it's paid; does it? This implies just a
- 10 few things have to take place.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 Q. Isn't that so?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. I don't believe that's what it says.
- 15 Q. Well, so when you say "other relevant codes,"
- 16 how many other relevant codes are you talking about?
- 17 You don't know; do you?
- 18 A. Sitting here, I don't remember a number, no.
- 19 Q. Have you ever seen a Minnesota Medicaid claim
- 20 form?
- 21 A. Yes, I believe I -- I was shown one early on. I
- 22 haven't looked at one lately.
- 23 Q. Do you know the percentage of Minnesota Medicaid
- 24 claims which are submitted electronically with no
- 25 paper involved at all? Do you know that?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 At what point in time, counsel?
- 3 MR. McKENNA: At any time.
- 4 A. No, I do not know what -- how -- the percent
- 5 that's done electronically.
- 6 Q. Please direct your attention to page 15 of your
- 7 report, and you list common examples of fraud and
- 8 abuse at the top of the page. Do you have any
- 9 opinion as to the percentage of each of those that is
- 10 present in Minnesota?
- 11 A. A percentage?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Do you have an opinion as to the amount in
- 15 dollars of each of those that's present in Minnesota?
- 16 A. I'm still --
- 17 This is the type of data I'm still looking
- 18 through.
- 19 Q. Well you've reviewed the things which have been
- 20 listed on the disclosures with respect to the support
- 21 for your opinion; isn't that true?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Okay. Do you know what percentage of Minnesota
- 24 Medicaid recipients are in managed care programs, now
- 25 or at any time during the period that you studied?

- 1 A. What percentage? No.
- 2 Q. Do you believe that the use of a managed care
- 3 program has an impact upon the degree of fraud and
- 4 abuse in the payments made by the Medicaid program to
- 5 the managed care organization?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 Q. That is a little awkward. Perhaps before you
- 8 have to scratch your head too much over that, let me
- 9 try it again.
- 10 You understand now that Minnesota, in company
- 11 with many other states, has moved more and more to a
- 12 managed care approach to the Medicaid program; is
- 13 that true?
- 14 A. I know that Minnesota has begun a managed care
- 15 Medicaid program, yes.
- 16 Q. And essentially the managed care program
- 17 involves Minnesota paying to another organization a
- 18 certain amount of money to provide services to a
- 19 population that needs to be served; correct?
- 20 A. I believe so, yes.
- 21 Q. And the degree of fraud and abuse that might be
- 22 present in such a program is primarily a problem of
- 23 the provider and not Medicaid in that circumstance;
- 24 isn't that true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. Theoretically, that's true.
- 2 Q. Do you know what form the Minnesota I.D. card
- 3 for a recipient of Medicaid takes?
- 4 A. No, I --
- 5 Seems that I read -- I have read something about
- 6 that, but I don't recall it at the moment.
- 7 Q. Now you characterized Minnesota as being a pay
- 8 and chase program. At one point in your opinion on
- 9 page 16 you say that the term "pay and chase"
- 10 describes the enforcement efforts of both Blue Cross
- 11 Blue Shield and of the Minnesota state programs, and
- 12 at the bottom of the next paragraph you refer to the
- 13 vestiges of pay and chase.
- 14 Are you there acknowledging that pay and chase
- 15 is no longer an accurate description of the Minnesota
- 16 program?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. Where
- 18 is the reference to the vestiges of the pay and
- 19 chase?
- MR. McKENNA: The end of the
- 21 paragraph right above paragraph D., page 16.
- MR. LINVILLE: Ah. I thought you were on
- 23 the next page. I'm sorry.
- 24 A. I'm saying that there's still pay and chase in
- 25 Minnesota.

- 1 Q. But it's not anywhere near as prevalent as it
- 2 once was; isn't that true? Isn't that what you're
- 3 saying when you say "vestiges?" Doesn't "vestiges"
- 4 mean the remaining traces of something which was once
- 5 more prevalent?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. There's still pay and chase here, I believe,
- 8 fully. I'm still looking at to see -- I'm still
- 9 analyzing all this stuff to see what's currently
- 10 happening.
- 11 Q. Ma'am, you're here to provide your expert
- 12 testimony in this deposition. Are you saying that
- 13 the principal parts of your opinion are yet to be
- 14 formed?
- 15 A. No. But I'm saying --
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 17 A. -- before I give a final opinion.
- 18 Q. All right. You no longer stand by the opinion
- 19 that the pay and chase describes the enforcement
- 20 efforts?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. I believe that pay and chase still describes the
- 23 efforts.
- 24 Q. All right. And is Minnesota involved in pay and
- 25 chase to a greater degree than any other state

- 1 program that you know of?
- 2 A. Sitting here right now, no, I would not say that
- 3 it is.
- 4 Q. Can you --
- 5 Can you refer me to a Medicaid program in any
- 6 other state or territory which is more advanced than
- 7 Minnesota in moving away from pay and chase?
- 8 A. Again, without further comparison to other
- 9 states, the answer is no.
- 10 Q. And again in paragraph -- the second paragraph
- 11 of paragraph C. on page 16, when you refer to pay and
- 12 chase being produced by the effort to make the
- 13 program user friendly, there's nothing wrong with
- 14 physicians wanting to be paid promptly; is there?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 A. I think not.
- 17 Q. And that's not unreasonably courting the favor
- 18 of physicians, to offer up a system that pays them
- 19 promptly; is it?
- 20 A. A system that pays them promptly, no.
- 21 Q. Well you seem to be implying here that we got
- 22 into this pay and chase thing because we were hungry
- 23 to attract doctors for the Medicaid program, and I
- 24 want to know whether you think there was something
- 25 wrong with the way we did it.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. I'm saying that when we began the program, we
- 3 did not have all the systems we have seen gradually
- 4 that we've had to put in, more and more and more
- 5 edits, et cetera, et cetera, to try to prevent
- 6 inappropriate payment. Those were not there at the
- 7 outset. And so I mean there's a reason that we've
- 8 decided we have to put all these edits and stuff in.
- 9 Q. Right.
- 10 A. So my point is that they were not there when we
- 11 began.
- 12 Q. Well do you not understand from your study of
- 13 this that even where all the additional edits and all
- 14 of the prepayment examination that takes place, that
- 15 claims are being paid more quickly now than they were
- 16 at the beginning of the program?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. Yes, I assume they're being paid more quickly.
- 19 Q. Okay. So I don't understand your point in
- 20 paragraph -- the second paragraph of paragraph C.
- 21 Are you --
- I mean you say that the pay and chase approach
- 23 can be traced back to this time, but you're not
- 24 suggesting we did anything wrong in setting it up
- 25 that way; is that right?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. I'm saying that we set it up on the honor code,
- 3 so to speak, and we have seen that we are having to
- 4 move away from just paying claims based on that
- 5 system. We are having -- we have seen that we have
- 6 to do something different about paying claims, and it
- 7 has more to do with whether they are paid in a timely
- 8 manner.
- 9 Q. Would it --
- 10 Would you not agree with me that a substantial
- 11 amount of effort has been expended in the Minnesota
- 12 system to move away from the payment of claims before
- 13 they are examined?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 15 A. I know that there has been some effort made to
- 16 move away from that. Again, that's -- that's the
- 17 type of stuff I'm still going through. But yes, I'm
- 18 aware that there has been effort made.
- 19 Q. Well as you sit there today, are you critical of
- 20 the amount of effort or the pace of the effort to
- 21 move away from payment before examination in the
- 22 Minnesota Medicaid program?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I'm not sitting here to be critical of that, I'm
- 25 just -- I'm still trying to figure out what all

- 1 they've done, but not to be critical of the effort.
- 2 Q. Okay. Let me refer your attention to page 17 of
- 3 your report, the second paragraph beginning with the
- 4 words "Administrative enforcement...." Please read
- 5 that to yourself.
- 6 A. Okay.
- 7 Okay.
- 8 Q. What is your source for your statement that
- 9 organizations responsible for administrative remedies
- 10 tend to be less aggressive and less well funded than
- 11 criminal enforcement agencies?
- 12 A. An example is the cutback in the SURS unit.
- 13 Q. No, my source is what --
- 14 My question is: What is your source for that
- 15 statement? Did you -- does that come from your
- 16 experience or from conclusions that you drew?
- 17 A. Part of that comes from my experience, yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. And part of it comes from your review of
- 19 documents in this case?
- 20 A. Well yes. I'm giving you an example of a
- 21 cutback when --
- 22 Q. All right. And you believe that SURS is less
- 23 well funded than criminal enforcement agencies?
- 24 A. I think it varies, but I think that quite
- 25 frequently that is the case.

- 1 Q. Do you know anything about what happened to the
- 2 budgets of criminal enforcement agencies at the same
- 3 time that the SURS budget was being cut back?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 5 question.
- 6 A. I have to stop and think about the fraud unit.
- 7 At the moment I'm just simply drawing a blank.
- 8 Q. Do you need to take a break?
- 9 A. Could we break for just a moment?
- 10 Q. Absolutely.
- 11 (Recess taken.)
- 12 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 13 Q. Do you know anything about what happened to the
- 14 budgets of criminal enforcement agencies at the same
- 15 time that the SURS budget was being cut back?
- 16 A. I've looked at that data. I will have to go
- 17 back and look at it again. When I made this --
- 18 When I wrote this, this was a statement of
- 19 something that happens in general.
- 20 Q. All right. What is the source of your knowledge
- 21 of the aggressiveness of Minnesota administrative
- 22 agencies?
- 23 A. I have not seen a whole lot yet to -- enough
- 24 that I can tell you whether I believe they -- they --
- 25 whether I would -- (coughing) sorry -- how aggressive

- 1 I would categorize it.
- 2 Q. So at least in Minnesota, you don't know whether
- 3 it's true that the administrative remedies
- 4 organizations are less aggressive and less well
- 5 funded than the criminal enforcement agencies,
- 6 although that may be true generally; right?
- 7 A. I would have to go back and look at the data.
- 8 I'm not --
- 9 Correct.
- 10 Q. Well do you have data about any criminal
- 11 enforcement agencies other than the Minnesota
- 12 Medicaid Fraud Control Unit?
- 13 A. As I remember and --
- I think that's all I have.
- 15 Q. Do you have data on any administrative
- 16 organizations other than SURS?
- 17 A. I don't recall.
- 18 Q. Now the next paragraph you say that "Another
- 19 problem is that -- the time that can pass before an
- 20 inappropriate payment is discovered and
- 21 investigated," and you say that "...by the time an
- 22 inappropriate payment is discovered and documented,
- 23 there are legal bars to a full recovery."
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 Q. Did I state that correctly from paragraph 17 --

- 1 page 17 of your report?
- 2 A. Yes, you did.
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: I'm sorry, if you were
- 4 reading, I don't think you read it correctly, if
- 5 that's what you meant.
- 6 MR. McKENNA: Well I'm just looking at the
- 7 screen, and I think it is the same, but I'll try it
- 8 again if you're concerned that I misplaced an
- 9 adjective or something.
- 10 Q. "Another problem is the time that can pass
- 11 before an inappropriate payment is discovered and
- 12 investigated, period. One common outcome is that by
- 13 the time an inappropriate payment is discovered and
- 14 documented, there are legal bars to a full recovery."
- 15 Did I read that correctly?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And the legal bar you're talking about is the
- 18 statute of limitations?
- 19 A. Yes, that's the prime --
- 20 Q. What is the Minnesota statute of limitations on
- 21 the recovery for a fraud?
- 22 A. I still do not know what the answer to that
- 23 question is.
- 24 Q. All right. Do you know what the Minnesota
- 25 statute of limitations is with respect to any kind of

- 1 action?
- 2 A. Not that I recall.
- 3 Q. Do you know whether or not, under the law of
- 4 Minnesota, the existence of fraud in connection with
- 5 a cause of action may have an effect upon the statute
- 6 of limitations?
- 7 A. I don't recall as I sit here.
- 8 Q. Would it be fair to say, then, that you don't
- 9 know the extent to which, if any, the observation in
- 10 this paragraph holds true for Minnesota enforcement
- 11 of Medicaid efforts?
- 12 A. No. That's something else that I will
- 13 eventually address specific to Minnesota. This is a
- 14 statement about in general, but --
- 15 Q. Why haven't you done that before now? I'm
- 16 curious. You've been working on this case since --
- 17 since June, and you know that now's the time for your
- 18 deposition, and the trial is in January. Why haven't
- 19 you addressed that before now and why haven't you
- 20 concluded your work on these other questions that you
- 21 keep telling me that you haven't got an opinion on
- 22 yet?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 Compound.
- 25 A. Because several different things have happened.

- 1 Q. Well I don't need for you to --
- 2 If they're personal things, that's fine. I
- 3 don't need for you to go into what the personal
- 4 reasons might be. I'm not here to delve into your
- 5 personal life, I just want to know whether --
- 6 Have you been asked to defer your opinion on
- 7 subjects until after this deposition?
- 8 A. No, I have not.
- 9 Q. You just haven't completed your work on these
- 10 things; is that it?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. And the next paragraph on page 17 says,
- 13 "Finally, comma, even if a judgment can be obtained
- 14 against the responsible provider, comma, often that
- 15 person or entity is unable to repay the
- 16 inappropriately received funds, period." Did I read
- 17 that correctly?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. What is your source for that statement? Just
- 20 your general experience?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Do you have an example of that having occurred
- 23 in Minnesota?
- 24 A. I don't recall seeing anything about that yet in
- 25 Minnesota. I'm -- as I sit here, I don't recall

- 1 having --
- 2 I don't know.
- 3 Q. All right. Then the final paragraph on page 17,
- 4 you say, "For this reason -- For these reasons, and
- 5 others, it is typical of 'pay and chase' enforcement
- 6 that only a small amount of inappropriate payments
- 7 are ever recovered by the health insurance program."
- 8 Did I read that correctly?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And are you speaking there about your general
- 11 experience or general understanding of the problems
- 12 of pay and chase?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Can you give me an example of any claim or any
- 15 inappropriate payment in Minnesota, the recovery of
- 16 which was prevented by one of the factors that you
- 17 expressed on page 17?
- 18 A. These are all factors that I'm still trying to
- 19 answer --
- 20 Q. So as --
- 21 A. -- specific to Minnesota.
- 22 Q. -- of the present time, you don't have an
- 23 example of any effort to collect an inappropriately
- 24 made payment that has been frustrated in Minnesota
- 25 because of one of these factors.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Objection.
- 2 A. Not to the point of being ready to say this
- 3 is --
- 4 I'm not ready to render a final opinion on
- 5 these, no.
- 6 Q. Well do you have an example of a payment that
- 7 was frustrated in recovery, or don't you? I mean if
- 8 you don't have one yet, that's fine, just tell me you
- 9 don't have one yet. But --
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 Q. -- your answer literally implies that you're not
- 12 ready to tell me.
- 13 A. I've given you an example of what I know when
- 14 the cutback occurred in SURS, for example, in '93 or
- 15 whenever, close to there, when obviously recovery
- 16 went way down. I mean I know that occurred. I don't
- 17 believe that's the only thing I've read, but at this
- 18 moment that's all I remember.
- 19 Q. Well are you --
- 20 Do you have recollection of reading about a
- 21 case, a particular instance in which an effort to
- 22 recover back an inappropriate payment in Minnesota
- 23 was frustrated by one of these factors?
- 24 A. A specific --
- 25 Q. Yes.

- 1 A. Specific case?
- 2 Q. Yes.
- 3 A. Sitting here, no, I don't remember specific
- 4 cases. I remember seeing statistics, for example,
- 5 on --
- 6 Q. Do you remember whether or not Medicaid fraud
- 7 control units, for example, have a national peer
- 8 organization of other Medicaid fraud control units?
- 9 A. Yes, there is an organization. There is an
- 10 organization that --
- 11 Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you know whether or not Minnesota's Medicaid
- 13 Fraud Control Unit has ever been recognized for
- 14 excellence in any area with regard to the evaluation
- 15 of its peer organization?
- 16 A. No, I don't.
- 17 Q. Do you know that --
- Do you know who I mean when I use the term
- 19 "HCFA?"
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Do you know whether or not HCFA has a practice
- 22 of examining Medicaid programs in the states and
- 23 territories and offering up to other Medicaid
- 24 programs what they consider to be examples of best
- 25 practices with regard to certain areas of Medicaid

- 1 enforcement?
- 2 A. Yes, I do.
- 3 Q. And do you know whether or not Minnesota's
- 4 Medicaid program has been recognized in any way by
- 5 HCFA in the area of best practices regarding one
- 6 aspect or another of their administration of the
- 7 Medicaid program?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 9 A. I have read materials that reflect that fact.
- 10 Q. Okay. Do you dispute that that was deserved?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. Okay. Do you have any idea where in the
- 13 hierarchy of effectiveness and efficiency Minnesota
- 14 stands with regard to the ranking of its Medicaid
- 15 program by HCFA?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 17 A. Ranking by HCFA in what respect?
- 18 Q. Well in any respect.
- 19 A. In what category?
- 20 Q. In any category. Do you have any information
- 21 like that?
- 22 A. The information I've read has talked about the
- 23 review you just mentioned, they were rated so highly,
- 24 I have seen data that reflects that.
- 25 Q. Okay. In fact what you have seen has indicated

- 1 uniformly, hasn't it, that the Minnesota Medicaid
- 2 program is regarded by HCFA, by peer organizations,
- 3 by other national experts, as being in many ways a
- 4 model of its kind?
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 A. I have seen information that says that the
- 7 Minnesota Medicaid program is highly recognized by
- 8 HCFA, and the example you gave a moment ago, I
- 9 remember seeing that, yes.
- 10 Q. Do you have any reason to dispute the accuracy
- 11 of that assessment?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. I have -- I have not read the assessment. I
- 14 read information that states that. And I'm not --
- No, I have no, as we sit here, no reason to
- 16 dispute that.
- 17 Q. Okay. And do you --
- 18 Do you yourself have an opinion as to where
- 19 Minnesota ought to properly be ranked with respect to
- 20 the overall quality of its Medicaid program from the
- 21 standpoint of detecting and preventing fraud and
- 22 abuse?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. No, that's -- that's not an opinion I have
- 25 formulated.

- 1 Q. And I'd like to direct your attention, please,
- 2 to paragraph -- or page 19, the first full paragraph
- 3 beginning with the words -- no, strike that. I'm --
- 4 yes, beginning with the word "Documents...."
- 5 A. Okay.
- 6 Q. Now the last sentence of that says, "For
- 7 example, a 1986 MFCU Strike Force Report states that
- 8 for every 20 dollars spent on investigative audits of
- 9 nursing homes, 190 dollars was disallowed." Does
- 10 that mean 190 dollars of claims for reimbursement, is
- 11 that what you mean?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 13 A. That is quoting -- that is quoting what the MFC
- 14 reported, and I believe it means -- again I'd have to
- 15 go back and -- and restudy all this, but 190 dollars'
- 16 worth of reimbursement sought was disallowed.
- 17 Q. All right. Now I notice that you use the word
- 18 "investigative" to qualify the word "audits" there;
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And in the next paragraph you -- this is where
- 22 you point out that field audits were not done of 25
- 23 percent of nursing homes and group homes on an annual
- 24 basis as required by statute; correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. What's the difference between a field audit and
- 2 an investigative audit?
- 3 A. To the best of my recollection, investigative
- 4 audit is the language that was used in the strike
- 5 force report. I have to go back and look at that,
- 6 but I believe that came from there. A field audit,
- 7 obviously, is where you go out to the facility and do
- 8 an on-site audit. Technically a field audit can be
- 9 an investigative audit.
- 10 Q. Well are you suggesting in those two paragraphs
- 11 that investigative audits are the same thing as field
- 12 audits?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. No, I'm not suggesting. I am just stating this
- 15 is in a report, this is -- are the numbers that the
- 16 Medicaid fraud unit itself presented.
- 17 Q. All right. Then perhaps you can explain to me
- 18 what you mean by the sentence that says,
- 19 "Notwithstanding that rate of recovery, it appears
- 20 that the state was not able to meet a statutory
- 21 requirement that 25 percent of nursing homes and
- 22 group homes be subject to a field audit annually."
- 23 Were you suggesting that if they had done the field
- 24 audits, that they would have recovered 190 dollars
- 25 for every 20 dollars expended in that audit?

- 1 A. I'm saying that regardless of whether an
- 2 investigative audit includes a field audit or --
- 3 Whatever type of investigative audit shows that
- 4 for every 20 dollars spent, 190 dollars was
- 5 disallowed. Now assuming that is merely a desk
- 6 audit, for example --
- 7 Q. I don't want you to assume anything. I want you
- 8 to tell me what you meant.
- 9 A. Well I'm telling you what the language in this
- 10 says.
- 11 Q. No. I want to know what you meant.
- 12 A. All right.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 Q. Let me see if I can't phrase the question in a
- 15 way that might make it easier for you to respond.
- The use of the word "notwithstanding" to refer
- 17 back to the previous paragraph makes me think that
- 18 you are implying that the failure to do the field
- 19 audits as required by statute meant that the state
- 20 was foregoing a recovery of 190 dollars for every 20
- 21 dollars expended. Were you suggesting that?
- 22 A. I am suggesting that -- let's see how I can say
- 23 this. It's taken all in context. A field audit
- 24 normally --
- When you go out and do a field audit, you're

- 1 looking at more things than you do a desk audit. I'm
- 2 not sure what they meant by "investigative audit,"
- 3 but we know that their own numbers say every
- 4 dollar -- 20 dollars we spent doing that, we -- 190
- 5 dollars were disallowed. Knowing that, they still
- 6 didn't do more than four percent of the audits of
- 7 nursing homes.
- 8 Q. All right. But you're telling me that so far as
- 9 you can -- are you --
- 10 As far as you are concerned, you're not sure
- 11 whether or not "investigative audit" means a desk
- 12 audit or a field audit.
- 13 A. But regardless, they spent 20 dollars and
- 14 disallowed 190 for all those 20 dollars.
- 15 Q. I understand that.
- 16 You're not telling me in these two paragraphs
- 17 that no desk audit was done of these nursing homes;
- 18 are you? You're simply saying that no field audit
- 19 was done.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 21 A. That's possible.
- 22 Q. Okay. And if "investigative audits" includes a
- 23 desk audit, then the state did not miss a recovery by
- 24 failure to do the field audit. They still got back
- 25 190 dollars for every 20 dollars spent in audit

- 1 effort; didn't they?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. That's possible. I would have to go back and
- 4 look at what this report actually says, but what you
- 5 said is possible.
- 6 Q. All right. Now do you know the percentage of
- 7 nursing homes and group homes that were subjected to
- 8 a desk audit every year?
- 9 A. No, I do not. I don't think I -- I --
- 10 I don't remember seeing that.
- 11 Q. It's possible that by utilizing desk audits
- 12 instead of field audits, that the Minnesota Medicaid
- 13 program was able to audit far more of these nursing
- 14 homes and group homes than if they had done field
- 15 audits. Isn't that possible?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 17 A. That's a possibility.
- 18 Q. Okay. What is it that makes a field audit more
- 19 desirable than a desk audit?
- 20 A. Well, number one, statutory requirement, but
- 21 number two, when you do a field audit you are looking
- 22 at much more data, you are looking at --
- 23 In a desk audit, it may be possible that you ask
- 24 a provider to send you X out of their files rather
- 25 than going to get it and rather than your having

- 1 seen -- your investigators actually having seen the
- 2 files. I mean in order to know --
- 3 For example, on a Medicaid cost report from a
- 4 nursing facility, I mean you have a cost report, but
- 5 in order to actually back up what -- what really
- 6 happened, you need to see books, and when you do a
- 7 desk audit, you're not seeing that.
- 8 Q. Now you're saying that in a desk audit, although
- 9 you may see the information including copies of the
- 10 books, that that's not as good as going out to the
- 11 facility and seeing the books. Is that what you're
- 12 telling me?
- 13 A. In the first place, quite often in a desk audit
- 14 you're not seeing all the books. When you go out and
- 15 do a field audit, you're sending your investigators
- 16 in, and it's not something that -- I mean they have
- 17 much more opportunity to see what really happened on
- 18 site than to see a selected group of papers that
- 19 comes in for a desk audit or a cost report.
- 20 Q. Now when they go to the site, they ask to see
- 21 only a selected group of papers; don't they? They
- 22 don't review every piece of paper in the whole
- 23 facility; do they?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. The scope can be quite narrow, the scope can be

- 1 quiet large.
- 2 Q. And isn't that true of a desk audit as well,
- 3 that the scope can be narrow or the scope can be
- 4 large?
- 5 A. Yes. But it's not -- it's not --
- 6 You would not normally expect to have a set of
- 7 books come in from a facility along with their cost
- 8 reports to desk audit -- to do a desk audit.
- 9 Q. Tell me what you've reviewed which informs you
- 10 what a desk audit consists of in the Minnesota
- 11 Medicaid program.
- 12 A. The material I have read so far when discussing
- 13 desk audits --
- 14 Q. What material?
- 15 A. Testimony.
- 16 Q. What testimony?
- 17 A. Sitting here, I don't remember whose testimony.
- 18 Q. Okay. And what was it that was said in that
- 19 testimony about what constituted a desk audit?
- 20 A. It was a discussion of asking providers to send
- 21 whatever you wanted to look at. Part of the file.
- 22 Q. Right.
- 23 A. And I don't -- you know --
- 24 Q. The desk audits have the power to ask for
- 25 anything they want to; don't they?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 2 A. Theoretically that's true.
- 3 Q. And the difference would be that if they went
- 4 out to the facility, there might be less time for
- 5 them to fake the books. Is that what you're saying?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. That's a possibility, too.
- 8 Q. Well I'm trying to get a handle on what is the
- 9 magic about going out to the site, aside from taking
- 10 a lot more time and expense.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 A. Well often you find when looking at the books,
- 13 it is not -- it is not --
- 14 It is not that it's never happened that there
- 15 were different sets of books. I mean that -- what
- 16 you just cited is a -- is within the realm of
- 17 possibility. But also you usually see a broader,
- 18 much broader scope even though you might have the
- 19 power to ask for something to be sent in. Quite
- 20 often you go and look at the books and you find that
- 21 there's even more than you thought.
- 22 Q. And how would that not be possible with the desk
- 23 audit?
- 24 A. Theoretically it may be possible.
- 25 Q. Okay. In a system of having --

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Wait a second. Wait a
- 2 second. Let her finish her answer.
- 3 A. I still don't know yet. I still have to look.
- 4 Nothing you've shown me, what I've read yet, is that
- 5 a desk audit hasn't been that broad.
- 6 Q. I thought you told me that you knew what a desk
- 7 audit was, from what you said.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 9 A. I just told you that I read about desk audits.
- 10 Doesn't tell you that I know what the scope of any
- 11 desk audit has been.
- 12 Q. I see. So you don't know what the scope of a
- 13 desk audit is in Minnesota.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 15 A. I don't know what the reality is of what the
- 16 scope of desk audits --
- 17 Q. All right.
- 18 A. -- has actually been.
- 19 Q. So you're extrapolating back to your experience
- 20 in Mississippi as to what your experience was on a
- 21 desk audit when you were working with a provider; is
- 22 that right?
- 23 A. No, I'm saying that I've read testimony here
- 24 saying we ask a provider to send us X, but I have
- 25 read nothing to -- to let me know how big X is.

- 1 Q. I see. So you don't know the scope of material
- 2 that might be sought and you can't compare that for
- 3 me with what would be seen if you went out to the
- 4 site; is that true?
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 A. I'm still reading this, but what I've seen so
- 7 far leads me to believe that their desk audits are
- 8 not as expansive.
- 9 Q. All right. But have you seen anything that
- 10 suggested to you that they couldn't be as expansive?
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 A. Sitting here, I'm not prepared to say no, they
- 13 could not be as expansive.
- 14 Q. And you've indicated the possibility, and I
- 15 suppose we've all read or heard about such things,
- 16 where some entity might have two sets of books;
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And those two sets of books, how would they be
- 20 more susceptible of discovery with a field audit than
- 21 they would be with a desk audit?
- 22 And I presume that if one set's fraudulent and
- 23 one set's the real ones, that the real ones which
- 24 would prove the fraud are hidden away somewhere; are
- 25 they not, usually?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 Q. Otherwise, why have two sets of books?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. That's
- 4 three questions asked.
- 5 A. Depending upon the circumstances of the case,
- 6 for example, if you use a fraudulent -- for example,
- 7 if you believe that something is fraudulently going
- 8 on and that the provider, for example, might destroy
- 9 evidence, you can go out and see the books. Now I
- 10 suppose theoretically the other books may not be
- 11 found, given your hypothesis. I won't say that's not
- 12 within the realm of possibilities.
- 13 Q. Well is a field audit necessarily an unannounced
- 14 field audit?
- 15 A. It is not necessarily unannounced.
- 16 Q. Do you know whether or not there are any
- 17 impediments in Minnesota to doing unannounced field
- 18 audits of nursing homes?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. Again, in all this material that I have just
- 21 read, I have read some language about due process, et
- 22 cetera, but I cannot remember what I was reading.
- 23 Q. Okay. You as an old -- as a former -- excuse
- 24 me, I didn't mean to put it that way.
- 25 As a former prosecutor, you would agree,

- 1 wouldn't you, that if a particular nursing home were
- 2 the target in a criminal investigation, the preferred
- 3 procedure would be to use a search warrant and not to
- 4 make an unannounced audit visit; wouldn't it?
- 5 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 6 Q. For purposes related to the Fourth Amendment?
- 7 A. I would agree that an unannounced is not the
- 8 norm.
- 9 Q. On page 20 in the first paragraph, I think it's
- 10 the sixth line down, the last two words on the right
- 11 are "In my...," and it begins the sentence that says,
- 12 "In my experience, desk audits are not a
- 13 particularly effective means of preventing fraud and
- 14 abuse." Would you tell me what your experience is
- 15 that leads you to have an opinion on that subject?
- 16 A. Yes. That experience is referring to when I was
- 17 a prosecutor and when I looked at desk audits and
- 18 found just what I'm saying, that when desk audits
- 19 were done, they were not as effective as field
- 20 audits.
- 21 Q. Okay. Anything else that forms the basis for
- 22 that statement?
- 23 A. Well some things that I have seen in the past
- 24 when desk audits were done, they were done by a
- 25 group -- sometimes it's done by an outside entity

- 1 which is paid to do desk audits by audit, per audit,
- 2 and the more audits you do, the more money you're
- 3 paid, and so the issue becomes quality or quantity.
- 4 Q. Well you have no reason to believe that that
- 5 principle applies to Minnesota in any way; do you?
- 6 A. No, I'm not sitting here saying that applies to
- 7 Minnesota. I don't know.
- 8 Q. All right.
- 9 A. But I'm not saying that at this moment.
- 10 Q. All right. Any other reason --
- 11 A. But the question was in my experience.
- 12 Q. Right. Well we're talking about Minnesota here
- 13 now. You know that. And your experience may be
- 14 elsewhere, but I want to know what about your
- 15 experience leads you to believe that Minnesota desk
- 16 audits are not a particularly effective means of
- 17 preventing fraud and abuse.
- 18 Are you saying that in your experience
- 19 Mississippi desk audits were not?
- 20 A. I'm saying that in my own personal
- 21 experience, --
- 22 Q. Yes.
- 23 A. -- yes, it was that way in Mississippi.
- 24 Otherwise, it's not particularly --
- 25 Q. All right. Let's go to the next paragraph. You

- 1 say that, "Finally, even if DHS had met the statutory
- 2 requirement of field auditing 25 percent of nursing
- 3 homes -- which it did not -- that, too, is an
- 4 imperfect fraud and abuse detection system. If a
- 5 nursing home is audited only once every four years,
- 6 there can be insurmountable statute of limitations
- 7 problems which prevent full recovery of Medicaid
- 8 payments." Have I got that basically right?
- 9 A. "Overpayments."
- 10 Q. Pardon?
- 11 A. "Overpayments."
- 12 Q. All right. But you don't know what the
- 13 Minnesota statute of limitations is on such
- 14 recoveries. That's what you told me a while ago;
- 15 correct?
- 16 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. I think
- 17 your prior question dealt with fraud.
- 18 MR. McKENNA: All right. Do you --
- I think I went broader than that, but we'll do
- 20 it right now.
- 21 Q. Do you know what the statute of limitations is
- 22 with respect to any action that might be relevant to
- 23 a recovery of Medicaid fraud and abuse overpayments?
- 24 A. I don't remember, sitting here, what the statute
- 25 is. I don't.

- 1 Q. So what is the source for your statement here
- 2 that if a nursing home was audited in Minnesota only
- 3 once every four years, there would be an
- 4 insurmountable statute of limitations problem?
- 5 A. It doesn't say that.
- 6 Q. Well it says an "insurmountable statute of
- 7 limitations problems."
- 8 A. In general, not necessarily in Minnesota, this
- 9 is a possibility.
- 10 Q. Well "DHS" refers to the Minnesota Department of
- 11 Human Services, and the "statutory requirement"
- 12 refers to the Minnesota statute requirement of field
- 13 auditing 25 percent of nursing homes and therefore
- 14 necessarily Minnesota nursing homes; does it not?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. Okay. So was this something that the lawyers
- 17 put in your report that you hadn't had a chance to
- 18 think through?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: I object to the form.
- 21 A. I put that in that report myself.
- 22 Q. All right. And what was your basis for the
- 23 statement about an insurmountable statute of
- 24 limitations problem if you don't know what the
- 25 Minnesota statute of limitations are that might be

- 1 affected?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. I'm not saying there is, I'm saying there can
- 4 be. And at the time I wrote this I still needed to
- 5 find out if it is.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. And I still stand by that. I'm still trying to
- 8 figure out what is actually going on here.
- 9 Q. I see.
- 10 A. I'm not saying it does exist, I'm saying it's a
- 11 possibility in general.
- 12 Q. All right. So if I represented to you that the
- 13 general Minnesota statute of limitations on actions
- 14 in district courts is six years, would that change
- 15 your opinion about whether or not there could be an
- 16 insurmountable statute of limitations problem with an
- 17 audit only once every four years?
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 19 A. Well if the statute of limitations is six years,
- 20 then that's a possibility.
- 21 Q. What's a possibility?
- 22 A. That, you know, this problem would be totally
- 23 overcome.
- 24 Q. All right.
- 25 A. But that's not what all that paragraph means.

- 1 Q. Well what else does that paragraph mean?
- 2 A. Something else that happens when -- and this
- 3 is -- again I'm basing it on my experience, not
- 4 Minnesota -- it's not uncommon for nursing homes, for
- 5 example, to be sold, and it's quite difficult when
- 6 you go in and try to detect what really happened and
- 7 there's been a change of ownership, et cetera.
- 8 Q. Well that's not a statute of limitations
- 9 problem; is it?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. And you don't know anything about whether or not
- 12 in Minnesota a person who owned or was in charge of a
- 13 nursing home would continue to be responsible for
- 14 fraud, do you, that occurred under their aegis even
- 15 though they sold the nursing home?
- 16 A. No. And this is still the type of stuff I'm
- 17 asking to get.
- 18 Q. Well I'm trying to understand. You make the
- 19 statement here in four bold lines that an
- 20 insurmountable statute of limitations problem --
- 21 A. "Can be."
- 22 Q. All right. And you did that, you made that
- 23 statement without even knowing what the statute of
- 24 limitations were in Minnesota; didn't you?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. I said "can be." I didn't say "is."
- 2 Q. You made that statement without knowing what the
- 3 statute of limitations was that was applicable to
- 4 such things; didn't you?
- 5 A. Yes, and that's why I said "can be."
- 6 Q. Well if the statute of limitations was longer
- 7 than four years, it wouldn't be an insurmountable
- 8 problem; would it?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 10 A. Again I have said "can be." I've not said this
- 11 is going on in Minnesota. That does not say that.
- 12 Q. You didn't think that you should be focused upon
- 13 Minnesota in this report that has to do with
- 14 Minnesota's litigation against the tobacco industry
- 15 when you were being asked to assess Minnesota's
- 16 Medicaid program?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I am still assessing Minnesota's Medicaid
- 19 program.
- 20 Q. Turning for the moment to page 22 of your
- 21 report -- actually I guess I need for you to go back
- 22 to page 21. Am I correct that paragraph G.,
- 23 consisting of two lines of text, and paragraph H.,
- 24 consisting of four short paragraphs, are the only
- 25 reference in your report to fraud and abuse detection

- 1 efforts in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota?
- 2 A. Paragraph G. does not refer to Blue Cross Blue
- 3 Shield.
- 4 Q. You're right. I'm sorry. I misread it myself.
- 5 So now we're down to paragraph H. on page 22 and
- 6 its four relatively short paragraphs. Those are all
- 7 that are in your report related to Blue Cross Blue
- 8 Shield and its efforts at fraud and abuse detection
- 9 and prevention; is that true?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And essentially what you have said is that their
- 12 fraud and abuse detection and enforcement efforts
- 13 were about on a par with respect to effectiveness as
- 14 the Minnesota programs; true?
- 15 A. Basically.
- 16 Q. What effort did you make to compare the
- 17 staffing, budget, or any other aspect of Blue Cross
- 18 Blue Shield with similar organizations around the
- 19 country?
- 20 A. I did not do any.
- 21 Q. So you don't know --
- 22 You didn't know when you wrote this report and
- 23 you don't know now whether or not Blue Cross Blue
- 24 Shield of Minnesota's efforts from the standpoint of
- 25 budget or staffing relative to Medicare -- or excuse

- 1 me, fraud and abuse prevention and detection, you
- 2 don't know whether that was out of the ordinary.
- 3 A. Compared to other Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 4 programs.
- 5 Q. Or similar organizations.
- 6 A. Blue Cross Blue Shield itself says that they
- 7 have one of the best programs in the country.
- 8 Q. All right.
- 9 A. And that's -- and they talk about programs from
- 10 the big Blue Cross Blue Shield national. There is
- 11 some language in the -- in the testimony about that,
- 12 there are some exhibits that I read. But the purpose
- 13 was to look at Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota
- 14 and see what was happening as far as inappropriate
- 15 payments being made, not how it compared to some
- 16 other program in the country.
- 17 Q. Well as I've said to you before, I'm not so much
- 18 interested in your purpose as I am your opinion about
- 19 subjects in response to my questions. And my
- 20 question is: Did you do anything to compare Blue
- 21 Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota to other similar
- 22 organizations around the country from the standpoint
- 23 of its budget, its staffing or other aspects of its
- 24 effort to detect and prevent fraud and abuse in its
- 25 program?

- 1 A. No. Only what I read from materials I saw.
- 2 Q. All right. So so far as you know, Blue Cross
- 3 Blue Shield of Minnesota's statement that they have
- 4 one of the best programs in the country is
- 5 probably -- is probably true.
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. I don't
- 7 think that's what she said.
- 8 A. I am saying that that's what Blue Cross says. I
- 9 don't know the truth of the matter.
- 10 Q. All right. Well I would --
- I can't resist pointing out to you that earlier
- 12 when you saw some national studies that talked about
- 13 10 percent, you wanted to rely upon not having seen
- 14 anything to prove that incorrect, and I want to know
- 15 whether you've seen anything to prove the statement
- 16 by Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota that they have
- 17 the best -- one of the best programs in the country
- 18 to be wrong? You don't have any reason to believe
- 19 that's not true; do you?
- 20 A. I have no reason to know, that's correct.
- 21 Q. So in the first -- the second full paragraph,
- 22 when you say, "Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota
- 23 appears to have a small staff, " you don't know
- 24 whether that staff is small in relation to the staffs
- 25 that are present in other organizations or not; do

- 1 you?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. In comparing -- comparison to other
- 4 organizations, that's a true statement.
- 5 Q. Okay. You don't know whether it's two or three
- 6 or five times as big as those other organizations; --
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 Q. -- do you?
- 9 A. I do not, that's correct.
- 10 Q. And in the second line of that paragraph when
- 11 you say, "The program integrity unit appears to have
- 12 undertaken few proactive investigations, " you don't
- 13 know whether or not the number of proactive
- 14 investigations is larger or smaller than other
- 15 organizations of similar kind around the country; do
- 16 you?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. What do you mean by "proactive investigations?"
- 19 A. I mean investigations of the type that Blue
- 20 Cross Blue Shield itself described. That's when they
- 21 went out and did audits of different providers, seems
- 22 like they were clinics and something else. There was
- 23 a period there when they went out and did audits on
- 24 their own. That I consider to be proactive.
- 25 Q. And in the last sentence in the second paragraph

- 1 beginning with the words "Most of their activity...,"
- 2 you say, "Most of their activity was limited to
- 3 responding to complaints received from subscribers or
- 4 from other departments within Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 5 of Minnesota." Is that a correct statement of your
- 6 language in that sentence?
- 7 A. That's a correct statement of my language.
- 8 Q. And are you referring there to the fact that
- 9 they worked on tips from subscribers and other
- 10 departments as to investigations to be done?
- 11 A. As I remember what I read about Blue Cross, yes,
- 12 they were -- they acted upon referrals from other
- 13 parts of their organization.
- 14 Q. All right. So "referrals" would be a more
- 15 accurate statement than "complaints;" would that be
- 16 true?
- 17 A. I think it's true that it could be both.
- 18 Q. Well let me tell you what my problem was. When
- 19 you say "Most of their activity was limited to
- 20 responding to complaints received from subscribers or
- 21 from other departments within Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 22 of Minnesota," that makes it sound like they were
- 23 kind of a customer service bureau, when in fact what
- 24 they were trying to do was to follow up on tips about
- 25 possible wrongdoing; right?

- 1 A. Program Integrity, yes.
- 2 Q. Right. There weren't complaints about, "Hey, I
- 3 didn't get my card" or "Somebody took my parking
- 4 space" or "The doctor was rude to me," they were
- 5 things about Program Integrity that they were
- 6 following up; right?
- 7 A. If I remember what I've read correctly, there --
- 8 there were complaints that came in to that department
- 9 that were not necessarily related to Program
- 10 Integrity. Now whether they -- I'm not sure that
- 11 they followed those up, but I think that there were
- 12 some -- there were some that came in.
- 13 Q. Well you understand that what they were telling
- 14 you was that their activity was following up upon
- 15 tips and referrals with respect to Program Integrity,
- 16 not dealing with the run-of-the-mill complaints that
- 17 come from subscribers or other departments; right?
- 18 You knew that's what they were saying.
- 19 A. As I remember they did receive, like, complaints
- 20 for perhaps some -- I'm sorry -- from subscribers
- 21 because of things like -- I'll have to go back and --
- 22 But I agree with you that perhaps I should have
- 23 added the word "referrals" in there.
- 24 Q. And if they were working on referrals or tips as
- 25 to wrongdoing, that would be an appropriate use of

- 1 their time; wouldn't it?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Because in a system where you're trying to
- 4 detect and prevent fraud, oftentimes a subscriber is
- 5 going to say, because they saw some document, that
- 6 doctor overcharged, and that would be a worthwhile
- 7 tip to follow up; wouldn't it?
- 8 A. I think so.
- 9 Q. Or that doctor didn't do that that he billed you
- 10 for, you'd want them to follow up on that; wouldn't
- 11 you?
- 12 A. I would.
- 13 Q. Now in the third paragraph, when you speak about
- 14 proactive provider audits and you then refer to a
- 15 range of error rates, now you know that you're
- 16 talking there about patient -- I mean, excuse me,
- 17 provider education programs, not fraud detection
- 18 audits; don't you?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. I know that that is how Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 21 categorized those audits.
- 22 Q. Okay. Well you're not suggesting they went out
- 23 and did what we were talking about a while ago as a
- 24 field audit on somebody and came up with 60 to 90
- 25 percent error rates on what they were doing; are you?

- 1 A. I am suggesting that according to what I saw,
- 2 they went out and looked at records to see if things
- 3 had been done correctly and still came up with these
- 4 error rates.
- 5 Q. Now here you're talking about, again, most
- 6 explicitly, fraud and abuse, with abuse including
- 7 errors that are innocent ones like using the wrong
- 8 key stroke or running the wrong code somewhere;
- 9 aren't you?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. You do acknowledge in the last sentence
- 12 of that paragraph that "The emphasis of these
- 13 provider audits appeared to have been on 'educating'
- 14 the providers to improve their future billings;"
- 15 right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. So you're not --
- 18 A. That's what I got from reading.
- 19 Q. You're not criticizing them being out there
- 20 saying they're being nice to these people cheating
- 21 the system; are you? You're saying what was going on
- 22 here was an effort to educate the clerical staff of
- 23 these providers to submit claims properly; right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. I am saying that what Blue Cross and Blue Shield

- 1 said it was doing was provider audit to help educate
- 2 providers to improve the future billings.
- 3 Q. Right.
- 4 A. I'm also saying that when they did this, they
- 5 discovered quite often error rates that are quite
- 6 high, and apparently the fact that that existed made
- 7 no difference.
- 8 Q. Okay. Well are you sitting here telling me that
- 9 this is an indication that there is 60 to 90 percent
- 10 fraud and abuse in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield of
- 11 Minnesota system?
- 12 A. I am saying that there may be payments that
- 13 should not have been made, I mean, based on -- if
- 14 there were --
- 15 If these were the error rates that were in the
- 16 forms, then there may be payments that should not
- 17 have been made. They may not be fraud, no.
- 18 Q. Well we spent a lot of time waltzing around the
- 19 definition of fraud and abuse. I don't want to do
- 20 that again.
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. But using your definition of fraud and abuse,
- 23 are you saying that there is a 60 to 90 percent rate
- 24 of fraud and abuse in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of
- 25 Minnesota system?

- 1 A. No, I'm not saying that.
- 2 Q. All right. Now so what you are saying is that
- 3 there are potentially a high number of clerical
- 4 errors that are made in filling out a form, and that
- 5 makes up the bulk of that 60 to 90 percent; isn't
- 6 that true?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. As I sit here now, I'd have to go back and look
- 9 at those to see what the different mistakes, or
- 10 whatever you want to characterize them, were, but it
- 11 was quite evident in the testimony that there were
- 12 error rates and that they were quite high in some of
- 13 them. And there was also testimony that some of
- 14 these were to be reaudited in hopes that those error
- 15 rates would have gone down. That didn't necessarily
- 16 happen. So I'm not sure about --
- I am sure I'm not sitting here telling you that
- 18 I'm saying that the error rate or the fraud rate,
- 19 whatever you call it, is 60 percent. I'm not saying
- 20 that.
- 21 Q. Actually you say 60 to 90 percent. But you're
- 22 not saying that that's the fraud and abuse rate.
- 23 A. No. I'm saying those are the rates that showed
- 24 up in those audits.
- 25 Q. All right. So if they're not fraud and abuse,

- 1 what are the components of that 60 to 90 percent?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 Q. Do you know?
- 4 A. The components of those -- again we're going
- 5 through this abuse thing; they're perhaps payments
- 6 that should not have been made.
- 7 Q. So by the definition that you offered earlier,
- 8 they are fraud and abuse; is that right?
- 9 A. No, I never said they were fraud.
- 10 Q. Fraud and abuse.
- 11 A. They may -- they may have contributed to
- 12 payments that should not have been made. I'm not
- 13 saying that they were fraudulent.
- 14 Q. Well I didn't ask you if they were fraudulent.
- 15 I referred to fraud and abuse in the same catch
- 16 phrase that you've used repeatedly in your report,
- 17 and you say fraud and abuse includes clerical errors
- 18 and payments that shouldn't have been made but which
- 19 came about through innocent error, and I want to know
- 20 if that's not what this 60 to 90 percent is. What is
- 21 the 60 to 90 percent?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. I believe you're mischaracterizing my
- 24 territory -- "territory" -- testimony to say that I
- 25 have said inappropriate payments from clerical errors

- 1 were fraud.
- 2 Q. I didn't say that. I didn't say that now or at
- 3 any time in this deposition.
- 4 A. What did you just say?
- 5 Q. "Fraud and abuse" is the phrase that you've used
- 6 over and over in your report and throughout your
- 7 testimony here, and you told me yesterday that abuse
- 8 included -- most specifically and repeatedly you told
- 9 me it included clerical errors and payments which
- 10 shouldn't have been made through innocent mistakes.
- MR. LINVILLE: Counsel, when we -- when we
- 12 come to a breaking point here, we're a little over
- 13 six hours now.
- MR. McKENNA: Well we're not there now.
- 15 MR. LINVILLE: Okay.
- 16 A. And I still say this could constitute abuse.
- 17 Q. I understand that. And I -- and given that
- 18 definition of fraud and abuse, what else --
- 19 A. That is not a definition of fraud and abuse.
- 20 Fraud and abuse are two different things.
- 21 Q. All right. The 60 to 90 percent includes some
- 22 fraud, but you don't know how much; true?
- 23 A. The 60 to 90 percent --
- MR. LINVILLE: I object to the form of the
- 25 question.

- 1 A. -- are error rates that were discovered in these
- 2 audits.
- 3 Q. Right.
- 4 A. Which I would have to go back and -- I don't
- 5 think they ever calculated it, I would have to go
- 6 back to see, because I don't remember as we sit here
- 7 whether they turned that in to amount of dollars that
- 8 may have been inappropriately paid. But I'm not
- 9 claiming that those dollars were fraudulent.
- 10 Q. I'm not saying that you did, --
- 11 A. And I am not putting --
- 12 Q. -- but you have told me -- you told me yesterday
- 13 that the issue you were commissioned to study here,
- 14 the instance of fraud and abuse in the Medicaid
- 15 system and in Blue Cross Blue Shield in Minnesota,
- 16 that that included two concepts, on the one hand
- 17 fraud, but in addition to that, abuse, which you
- 18 specifically and repeatedly defined as including
- 19 clerical errors and other payments which shouldn't
- 20 have been made but which came about as a result of an
- 21 innocent mistake. Now taking those two things
- 22 together, that's what this 60 to 90 percent is, --
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the --
- 24 Q. -- or is there something else, --
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 Q. -- something that doesn't meet the definition of
- 2 either fraud or abuse as you mean it that goes into
- 3 this 60 to 90 percent?
- 4 A. The 60 to 90 percent error rate, I will have to
- 5 go back and look again because I don't remember the
- 6 types of error rates that there were. There is
- 7 discussion in testimony about whether that caused
- 8 inappropriate payments to be made. I don't remember
- 9 sitting here. I'd have to go back and look at it.
- 10 My point is if there are error rates that high, that
- 11 may translate, yes, into inappropriate payments, but
- 12 I'm not characterizing them nor trying to
- 13 characterize them as fraud.
- 14 Q. And I am not accusing you of that. You're
- 15 fighting with a straw person there. I have never
- 16 said anything like that. I have taken the term
- 17 "fraud and abuse," which has appeared repeatedly
- 18 throughout this deposition and appears on every page
- 19 of your report, as being the two phenomena which
- 20 together you were supposed to assess as a part of
- 21 your work in this case. All right? I've not accused
- 22 you of saying that was 60 to 90 percent of fraud, but
- 23 60 to 90 percent of both fraud and abuse as you've
- 24 defined that latter term. True?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. It's a 60 to 90 percent error rate.
- 2 Q. All right.
- 3 A. Now we have to go back and look at what the
- 4 errors actually were, and sitting here I'm not
- 5 prepared to tell you because I don't remember --
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. -- whether those errors translated into payments
- 8 that should not have been made.
- 9 Q. All right. Now at the time that you made out
- 10 this report, you were obviously not concerned
- 11 about -- were concerned about not doing something
- 12 that was misleading; correct? So you wouldn't have
- 13 put 60 to 90 percent in here in connection with an
- 14 assessment of fraud and abuse unless you felt that it
- 15 was connected somehow meaningfully to inappropriate
- 16 payments; would you?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 18 question.
- 19 Q. Or were you just throwing around a number
- 20 without knowing what it meant in this context?
- 21 A. No, I was not throwing around a number. I'm
- 22 throwing around -- out a number --
- I'm not throwing out a number. I've included
- 24 this number because it came from Blue Cross Blue
- 25 Shield itself --

- 1 Q. Yes?
- 2 A. -- showing that they had done provider
- 3 audits, --
- 4 Q. Yes.
- 5 A. -- and in doing provider audits they discovered
- 6 in some instances an error rate of 60 to 90 percent.
- 7 Q. Right.
- 8 A. Now the next question is: Did those error
- 9 rates, whatever they are, --
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. -- result in inappropriate payments made by Blue
- 12 Cross.
- 13 Q. Yes. Maybe I should let you ask the question.
- 14 And I'm saying to you that your inclusion of
- 15 that statistic in this report, did you not mean to
- 16 imply that that somehow was -- that that 60 to 90
- 17 percent number was related to inappropriate
- 18 payments? Is that why you included it? Because if
- 19 it wasn't, what's the relevance of throwing it in
- 20 there?
- 21 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 22 A. The relevance of throwing it -- including it is
- 23 that, for example, Blue Cross itself said that in a
- 24 year or two they would go back and reaudit some of
- 25 these providers to see if they indeed had improved

- 1 their billing based on this. Some of those audits
- 2 were never conducted, as I remember, and some of them
- 3 were conducted and we -- and there still were fairly
- 4 high error rates. So my point for including it is
- 5 there may very well have been inappropriate billing,
- 6 and that in the following-up period when --
- 7 I mean the purpose of this was to stop the
- 8 inappropriate billing. What Blue Cross Blue Shield
- 9 itself said it planned to do did not occur --
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. -- after.
- 12 Q. So neither you nor Blue Cross Blue Shield is
- 13 saying that 60 to 90 percent of inappropriate
- 14 payments took place based upon any provider audit at
- 15 any time; correct?
- 16 A. I think what we're both saying is that there was
- 17 a high level of error rate. What you have to do is
- 18 translate those error rates into inappropriate
- 19 payments.
- 20 Q. Okay. I think you know enough by now to know
- 21 that I'm going to go back and ask my question again
- 22 to see if you'll answer it.
- 23 Neither you nor Blue Cross Blue Shield is saying
- 24 that 60 to 90 percent of inappropriate payments took
- 25 place based upon any provider audit at any time;

- 1 isn't that true?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 3 question.
- 4 Q. Is that -- is that true?
- 5 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 6 A. I think that's a fair statement. I think we're
- 7 both saying you have to see.
- 8 Q. All right. So in trying to apply our knowledge
- 9 of the system and our common sense to figure out what
- 10 this 60 to 90 percent means, it's very likely, isn't
- 11 it, that a very high percentage of that 60 to 90
- 12 percent has to do with simple, innocent, maybe even
- 13 irrelevant clerical errors which were found when the
- 14 forms were examined; right? And without much more
- 15 information, you can't say that it has anything to do
- 16 with improper payment.
- 17 A. If I remember reading testimony correctly, there
- 18 is testimony in a deposition that at least discusses
- 19 this and the fact that there may have been at least
- 20 an effect on the amount of payment that was made as a
- 21 result. I will have to go back and find the
- 22 testimony.
- 23 Q. In the last line in that paragraph you put the
- 24 word "educated" in quotes. Were you trying to imply
- 25 that this wasn't really educating the providers?

- 1 A. I was putting in quotes the word that they used,
- 2 which is "educated."
- 3 Q. Yes.
- 4 A. That's why --
- 5 Q. They also used the word "providers," but you
- 6 didn't put that in quotes; did you?
- Were you implying that it wasn't really
- 8 educating the providers?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Or were you somehow suggesting that -- that
- 11 instead of educating them, they ought to have been
- 12 investigating them?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. You understood, didn't you, that all that was
- 15 involved here is that they went out and they looked
- 16 at a bunch of providers to see whether the forms were
- 17 being filled out right, and they found a lot of
- 18 instances when they weren't, as many as 60 to 90
- 19 percent, but that that number has nothing to do with
- 20 improper payments or fraud or abuse? You know that;
- 21 don't you?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object. Object to the form.
- 23 A. No, I do not know that.
- 24 Q. Okay. Now in the last sentence you say, "Blue
- 25 Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota employees appeared

- 1 reluctant to recognize the implications of these
- 2 error rates as applied against the overall level of
- 3 payments made to the audited providers."
- 4 Now are you suggesting that these error rates
- 5 ought to have been applied against the overall level
- 6 of payments made to audited providers to draw the
- 7 conclusion that there was 20 to 30 percent fraud and
- 8 abuse or 60 to 90 percent fraud and abuse?
- 9 A. No, I'm not trying to say --
- 10 I am not trying to say in here at all that based
- 11 on these audits I'm prepared to say there were 60 to
- 12 90 percent.
- 13 Q. No.
- 14 A. I'm not. That has nothing to do with --
- 15 Q. Thank you.
- 16 What I'd like to know is: Were you trying to
- 17 say that these error rates ought to be --
- 18 When you say it should be applied against the
- 19 overall level of payments, how? Applied how?
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: To the audited providers.
- 21 MR. McKENNA: No. That doesn't make any
- 22 sense. Please don't correct my question.
- MR. LINVILLE: Wait, counsel. Counsel, you
- 24 were reading something here.
- MR. McKENNA: Yes, I was.

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: You read a piece of a
- 2 phrase.
- 3 MR. McKENNA: That's true, I did.
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: You didn't read the rest of
- 5 the phrase.
- 6 MR. McKENNA: I don't have to read the
- 7 whole phrase. I can ask the questions the way I
- 8 want.
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Then I object. It's an
- 10 improper question.
- 11 Q. When you say these error rates are supposed to
- 12 be applied against the overall level of payments,
- 13 what did you mean by that? Applied how? For what
- 14 purpose?
- 15 A. If error rates included in a -- the 20 to 30
- 16 percent or 60 to 90 percent, whichever range you want
- 17 to use, if some of those error rates resulted in
- 18 improper payments, particularly a year or two later
- 19 when supposedly there will be audits done to make
- 20 sure that this was not reoccurring, and in instances
- 21 where the audits were not even done, I mean if
- 22 inappropriate payments were made to these providers
- 23 for whatever reason, nothing was ever done about it.
- 24 Q. Okay. And that's what your statement is now,
- 25 that nothing was ever done about it?

- 1 A. Well perhaps "nothing" is too broad. There
- 2 is -- but there is testimony that, for example, the
- 3 Program Integrity was perhaps aware of this. Again
- 4 there is -- there is the testimony that the follow-up
- 5 audits that were intended to be done did not all take
- 6 place.
- 7 Q. Well I'm still trying to get an answer to my
- 8 question. What did you mean "applied against the
- 9 overall level of payments?" Was somebody supposed to
- 10 take this number and figure somehow or another that a
- 11 comparable percentage of the overall payments was
- 12 suspect in some way? What did you mean by that
- 13 phrase "applied against the overall level of
- 14 payments?"
- 15 A. I mean that if you, Blue Cross Blue Shield, --
- 16 Q. Right.
- 17 A. -- identified that out of these -- let's say the
- 18 60 to 90 percent error rate, or I don't care, the 20
- 19 to 30 percent, let's say that you discovered that as
- 20 a result of those errors there were 3,000 dollars'
- 21 worth -- 3,000 dollars paid inappropriately to me,
- 22 that I'm not saying you should say 30 to -- 20 to 30
- 23 percent of what I was paid or 60 to 90 percent of
- 24 what I was paid, but if you have identified that I
- 25 was paid 3,000 dollars erroneously, then you know

- 1 that I was paid 3,000 dollars erroneously.
- 2 Q. But you just told me a while ago that these 60
- 3 to 90 percent numbers, and for that matter the 20 to
- 4 30 percent, did not mean necessarily that there were
- 5 erroneous payments.
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 7 A. And if you listen to what I just said to you, --
- 8 Q. Yes.
- 9 A. -- I'm saying to look at the claims, the -- the
- 10 errors --
- 11 Q. I assure you I'm listening to what you say.
- 12 A. If you take the errors which are identified,
- 13 whatever the percentage, --
- 14 Q. Yes.
- 15 A. -- and go through the errors one by one, --
- 16 Q. Yes.
- 17 A. -- and you discover dollars that were paid that
- 18 should not have been --
- 19 Q. Yes.
- 20 A. -- because of this error.
- 21 Q. Yes.
- 22 A. Let's even go take the hypothesis of a 90
- 23 percent error rate.
- 24 Q. Uh-huh.
- 25 A. But when you looked at those rates you

- 1 discovered that 10, not 10 percent, but 10 errors
- 2 resulted in an overpayment of dollars, then you know
- 3 how many dollars I was paid erroneously. That's what
- 4 I'm saying.
- 5 Q. All right. And therefore you are saying that
- 6 nobody ever did anything about those 60 to 90
- 7 percent, to check whether or not those 60 to 90
- 8 percent of errors resulted in improper payments; is
- 9 that your testimony?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 11 A. Again I will have to go back to the testimony.
- 12 There is some language about discussing that in the
- 13 testimony --
- 14 Q. Well --
- 15 A. -- but --
- 16 Q. -- if that was an opinion you formed, you don't
- 17 know it now; is that right? You need to go back and
- 18 re-examine it.
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. It is my opinion that the follow-up that should
- 21 have occurred didn't.
- 22 Q. Okay. And that follow-up would have been to
- 23 examine these errors to determine whether any one of
- 24 them resulted in improper payment.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 Q. Is that what you're saying?
- 2 A. And go beyond that and recover it.
- 3 Q. Okay. And your testimony is that that didn't
- 4 happen.
- 5 A. To the best of my knowledge, that's not what
- 6 happened.
- 7 Q. Is that what you meant when you said they
- 8 appeared reluctant to recognize the implications in
- 9 these error rates?
- 10 A. Yes, that is what I meant.
- 11 MR. McKENNA: Did you want to take a break
- 12 now? You asked for one some time ago. I'll be glad
- 13 to do it now.
- MR. LINVILLE: Yeah. Okay.
- 15 (Recess taken.)
- 16 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 17 Q. When you refer in your report to prior -- to
- 18 reviewing a claim before it's paid by a human being,
- 19 you're not suggesting that that ought to be the
- 20 system that's adopted in Minnesota. You haven't
- 21 formed a conclusion about that; is that right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 23 A. No, I'm not --
- 24 Q. Do you know any -- sorry. Had you finished your
- 25 question -- your answer?

- 1 A. No, I --
- 2 That's not a recommendation I have made in this
- 3 report.
- 4 Q. All right. Do you know a program in any of the
- 5 states or territories where a higher percentage of
- 6 claims is reviewed by a human being than is the case
- 7 in Minnesota?
- 8 A. I haven't actually tried to look at anything
- 9 like that, so no, I do not. I haven't tried to
- 10 compare that.
- 11 Q. Do you know whether or not the edits that are
- 12 employed in the Minnesota computer -- Medicaid
- 13 computer system, whether those attempt to focus upon
- 14 the common types of fraud that you've cited in your
- 15 report?
- 16 A. I would have to go back and look at specific
- 17 edits, but I have no reason to believe that, as we
- 18 sit here, that they're not trying to edit as much as
- 19 possible.
- 20 Q. When one of these edits produces a positive
- 21 result, do you have any idea what happens to the
- 22 claim at that point in Minnesota's system?
- 23 A. What do you mean "a positive result?"
- MR. LINVILLE: Yeah. Object to the form.
- 25 Q. When the claim is identified in some way as

- 1 being an outlier, as you referred to earlier.
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. The -- any -- Medicaid has --
- I mean there are options. There's more than one
- 5 thing to could happen.
- 6 Q. I'm talking about the Minnesota program now.
- 7 A. I know. But Minnesota has options too, as I
- 8 remember.
- 9 Q. I just want to know what the Minnesota options
- 10 are. Tell me what they are.
- 11 A. Well if you have --
- 12 If they get a report, an outlier report for
- 13 example, first they will probably look at -- at least
- 14 from my understanding of the testimony, they look at
- 15 basically standard deviations and see how far from --
- 16 far out they are. That's one possibility. They
- 17 can -- I mean there -- there are many options. They
- 18 can request a claims review of all of the claims.
- 19 They can deny a claim. They can --
- There are different options.
- 21 Q. Well okay. Is it your understanding that once
- 22 the computer -- once one of those edits is triggered,
- 23 one of the things that it was programmed to look for
- 24 it finds, is it your understanding that then a human
- 25 being looks at that?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. And I
- 2 think you have to be real clear because I think there
- 3 may be some confusion about what computer programs
- 4 and what edits or logic you're talking about. But I
- 5 just want the record to be clear.
- 6 McKENNA: How could there be? I mean there
- 7 aren't two computer programs; there's one.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: No, there's a computer
- 9 program that identifies outlier reports, and there's
- 10 a discussion about that, and there's a computer
- 11 program that does claims processing, and I think
- 12 that's getting somewhat jumbled here.
- MR. McKENNA: Well I think you're the only
- 14 one that doesn't seem to understand it. I don't
- 15 think anything is jumbled.
- 16 Q. You understand that when a claim comes in on
- 17 Medicaid, that it's put into the computer and the
- 18 computer runs a number of front-end edits on it, as
- 19 many as a thousand, to determine whether or not there
- 20 is some aspect of that claim that meets a criteria
- 21 that has been decided upon when the computer was
- 22 programmed. You know what I'm talking about?
- 23 A. Yes. The computer --
- 24 Q. Some of the more simple ones might be if it
- 25 seems to be identical to an earlier claim that was

- 1 paid, for example; right?
- 2 A. That's a possibility, yes.
- 3 Q. Okay. And when the computer determines that one
- 4 of the things it was taught to look for is present,
- 5 then that file is, as they say, pended. You
- 6 understand that?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 8 A. Yes, that claim can be pended.
- 9 Q. All right. And once it's pended, does a human
- 10 being then look at it?
- 11 A. Well theoretically they could send it back for
- 12 denial. This is what I'm trying to say, they can do
- 13 several things.
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 A. That's one of them, just deny it.
- 16 Q. And the program is -- perhaps I didn't --
- I wasn't trying to mislead you. I think we both
- 18 know the program is designed that some claims -- some
- 19 edits produce an automatic denial.
- 20 A. Right.
- 21 Q. Right. And the computer spits out a denial;
- 22 right?
- 23 A. Right.
- 24 Q. Without a human being seeing that.
- 25 A. Right.

- 1 Q. Until the provider opens the envelope; right?
- 2 A. Right.
- 3 Q. Okay. But other pended claims are reviewed by a
- 4 human being; true?
- 5 A. Yes, there are pended claims that are reviewed
- 6 by human beings, as I understand it.
- 7 Q. And essentially is it true, with respect to all
- 8 of these edits, that any claim that is -- that
- 9 triggers one of those edits is not paid until that
- 10 edit is resolved in one way or another?
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 12 A. If the computer spits something out and does not
- 13 deny it, then it is my understanding that they try to
- 14 check to see what the problem is.
- 15 Q. Before payment.
- 16 A. At least in --
- 17 As I remember, in many cases, yes, that's what
- 18 they do.
- 19 Q. And if --
- 20 Assuming that it's true that there are 997 edits
- 21 in this claims processing system, there are 997
- 22 different circumstances, then, that might produce at
- 23 least a delay in the payment of the claim; isn't that
- 24 true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.

- 1 A. There are a huge number of possibilities of
- 2 delaying paying a claim, that is correct.
- 3 Q. Do you have some problem with my saying that
- 4 assuming that there are 997 edits, that there are
- 5 997 --
- 6 A. No.
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. I just
- 8 wanted you to let him finish before you answer so you
- 9 know exactly what the question is.
- 10 Q. Sure. If you make the assumption that there are
- 11 997 edits, then there are at least 997 ways that this
- 12 gets sidetracked before payment; true?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. Assuming that a situation doesn't exist where
- 15 they have apparently done at times, which is turn off
- 16 an edit or announce -- put a code in that says
- 17 circumvent the edit or whatever, then yes, there are
- 18 however many possibilities.
- 19 Q. Okay. And is it also your understanding that
- 20 this claims processing system continues to massage
- 21 and analyze those claims to identify patterns with
- 22 respect to certain providers or beneficiaries that
- 23 meet criteria that are indicative of fraud or abuse?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 25 A. It's my understanding that the ability exists to

- 1 look at, as I've already called them, outliers to
- 2 check what they call patterns of over-utilization.
- 3 That ability exists.
- 4 Q. And is it also possible, as was your experience
- 5 in Minnesota, for an investigative agency to ask for
- 6 a special run or a special analysis of data by the
- 7 computer to single out a certain provider, for
- 8 example, and have a look at all of his
- 9 hysterectomies, for example?
- 10 MR. LINVILLE: You may have misspoke on
- 11 that question.
- MR. McKENNA: Yes.
- 13 Q. It is your --
- 14 It's possible, as was your experience in
- 15 Mississippi, for an investigative agency to ask for a
- 16 special run or a special analysis of data by the
- 17 computer to single out a certain provider, for
- 18 example, and have a look at all of his
- 19 hysterectomies, for example.
- 20 A. It's my understanding that there is the ability
- 21 to generate many different types of reports by --
- 22 by --
- Yes.
- 24 Q. And all of these edits that we talked about
- 25 before can --

- 1 And the 997, assuming there are that many, those
- 2 are done before any payment is made; aren't they?
- 3 A. Yes. The edits that will kick out the claims
- 4 are done prior.
- 5 Q. And it's your understanding that many of those
- 6 result in a payment prior to the time that they are
- 7 resolved either by a denial or a human being looking
- 8 at them?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 10 A. As sit here now, I believe that is the case. I
- 11 have --
- I need to go back, I think, to read more
- 13 testimony, but I believe that's a fairly correct
- 14 statement.
- 15 Q. Now you understood when you did this report that
- 16 the litigation had to do with a claim over medical
- 17 expenditures regarding illnesses which arguably are
- 18 caused by smoking. You understood that.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And that that sort of all by itself largely
- 21 excluded the AFDC component of Medicaid; didn't it?
- 22 A. I believe so, yes.
- 23 Q. All right. And so primarily what we were --
- 24 what we're talking about are --
- You can refer to page six of your report where

- 1 you talk about the classes of beneficiaries --
- 2 categories of beneficiaries.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 Q. Mostly what we're talking about is the
- 5 low-income aged and the low-income disabled; true?
- 6 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 7 question.
- 8 A. I believe that is so.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now taking the issue of recipient or
- 10 beneficiary fraud and abuse, the primary issue with
- 11 respect to these populations that might be relevant
- 12 to tobacco-related illnesses would be whether or not
- 13 their income met the proper standards for
- 14 eligibility; wouldn't it?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 16 A. I don't quite --
- 17 I didn't understand that question.
- 18 Q. Sure. Let me come back at it the other way.
- 19 Since we're talking about tobacco-related
- 20 illnesses here, people are not going to fake a
- 21 condition that will lead to them getting
- 22 chemotherapy, for example; right?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I think that's a true statement.
- 25 Q. Right. And so mostly it's not going to be like

- 1 some drug-seeking behavior that might be prevalent in
- 2 other aspects of the Medicaid program; true?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I'm not sure what you asked me.
- 5 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 6 A. What's not going to be like some drug-seeking
- 7 behavior that might be prevalent?
- 8 Q. The kind of fraud that would be involved in an
- 9 analysis of that portion of the plaintiffs' damages
- 10 in this case which are improperly inflated due to
- 11 fraud and abuse.
- 12 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 13 question.
- 14 Q. Well if you're puzzled, let me try again.
- 15 A. Please.
- 16 Q. We are --
- 17 You realize that the state of Minnesota and Blue
- 18 Cross Blue Shield are claiming damages for
- 19 expenditures which had to be made because of
- 20 tobacco-related illnesses under various aspects of
- 21 Minnesota law. You understand that.
- 22 A. Yes, I understand that.
- 23 Q. And those tobacco-related illnesses implicate
- 24 only a certain couple of categories of recipients of
- 25 Medicaid. We talked about that. It's going to be

- 1 primarily the low-income aged and the low-income
- 2 disabled; true?
- 3 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 4 A. I don't know that to be true.
- 5 Q. Okay. What other populations did you understand
- 6 would be involved in the damages picture with respect
- 7 to tobacco-related illnesses?
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Excuse me. There may have
- 9 just been a confusion in the way you asked that
- 10 question.
- 11 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 12 A. What I have looked at is the Medicaid population
- 13 and where dollars are going, et cetera. I have not
- 14 taken into consideration what the illnesses are, I
- 15 mean the diagnoses or anything. I strictly looked at
- 16 the numbers of the program and where -- where the
- 17 dollars are going.
- 18 Q. So you made no effort in your analysis to try to
- 19 more particularly study the extent to which fraud and
- 20 abuse may have inappropriately affected the damages
- 21 for tobacco-related illnesses; is that what you're
- 22 telling me? You studied the program as a whole.
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 Q. And do you not believe that there may be some
- 25 significant differences in the rates of fraud and

- 1 abuse among the low-income aged and the low-income
- 2 disabled as opposed to the fraud and abuse in the
- 3 AFDC component of Medicaid?
- 4 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 5 (Witness reads computer screen.)
- 6 A. I believe that there are more Medicaid --
- 7 Minnesota Medicaid dollars going to the low-income
- 8 aged and the low-income disabled here in Minnesota
- 9 than there are going to the AFDC population.
- 10 Q. Why is it you give me that information in
- 11 response to the question?
- 12 A. Because I'm not really sure --
- 13 Q. I didn't ask you anything to do with that.
- 14 A. I do -- I can't --
- I do not know sitting here that there are
- 16 significant differences in the rates of fraud and
- 17 abuse.
- 18 Q. At any rate, you didn't attempt to -- to adjust
- 19 your -- your analysis to take into account the fact
- 20 that we're talking here about tobacco-related
- 21 illnesses, you simply studied the whole Medicaid
- 22 program; is that right?
- 23 A. That is correct.
- 24 Q. Do you understand that in Minnesota, as in most
- 25 states, the number of people who are employed by the

- 1 SURS unit or the Medicaid fraud unit and the budget
- 2 to be applied to that function is a public policy
- 3 question to be decided in large part by the
- 4 legislature?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And would you agree with me that the extent to
- 7 which the government of a state chooses to have a
- 8 more or less vigorous law enforcement effort is a
- 9 legitimate public policy decision to be reached by
- 10 that state legislature?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. In other words, if they want to have a really
- 13 strict system, that's an appropriate thing for them
- 14 to decide, and if they want to have a comparatively
- 15 lax one, that's an appropriate thing as well.
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 17 A. I'm not going to speak for what they should be
- 18 able to do, but I -- it's --
- 19 Yes, I will agree that it's an issue they should
- 20 address.
- 21 Q. It's a legitimate issue for them to address;
- 22 isn't it? Part of their sovereignity as a state.
- 23 A. I have no argument with that.
- 24 Q. Now when we were talking about your definition
- 25 of abuse as including inappropriate payments made

- 1 through clerical errors and innocent mistakes, those
- 2 kinds of errors can run both ways, can't they,
- 3 resulting in overpayment or underpayment?
- 4 A. Theoretically, that's possible.
- 5 Q. Well was it --
- 6 Are you suggesting that it isn't true in
- 7 practice but only in theory?
- 8 A. I'm not saying it doesn't happen in practice,
- 9 I'm saying I'm not -- I've not seen anything to
- 10 indicate a whole lot of it.
- 11 Q. Well I'll ask you to think this through for a
- 12 moment. If we're talking here now about clerical
- 13 errors and innocent mistakes, isn't it equally likely
- 14 that those errors would result in an underpayment, or
- 15 an application for underpayment, as it is that they
- 16 would result in an application for overpayment?
- 17 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I suppose that's theoretically possible, but if
- 19 that happens, then one would think that --
- 20 If that happened, the provider or recipient who
- 21 was, in quotes, underpaid, would be coming back and
- 22 asking for the rest of it.
- 23 Q. All right.
- 24 A. And I haven't seen -- I have seen nothing to
- 25 tell me that has happened. I just don't know.

- 1 Q. You haven't done anything to analyze that
- 2 component.
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. All right. You point out in your report that
- 5 Medicaid is a federally supported program, the exact
- 6 dimensions of which are determined from state to
- 7 state.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form. Are you
- 9 reading from a particular page?
- MR. McKENNA: No, I'm not.
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Okay.
- 12 A. There is federal participation, there are
- 13 federal statutes, but each state has some leeway in
- 14 to how to develop its own program, correct, as long
- 15 as it meets federal guidelines.
- 16 Q. Right. And you have pointed out in your report
- 17 that Minnesota has opted for most of the optional
- 18 coverages; correct?
- 19 A. That is my understanding, that's correct.
- 20 Q. And you're not critical of the state of
- 21 Minnesota for doing that; are you?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. That's an appropriate decision for them to make
- 24 in terms of how they view their responsibility to
- 25 their population; true?

- 1 A. I agree with that.
- 2 Q. On page seven of your report at the bottom of
- 3 the page, you say that one Medicaid concept with
- 4 special relevance is the concept of beneficiary
- 5 eligibility. Why is that concept of special
- 6 relevance to this case?
- 7 A. Eligibility ben -- I'm sorry.
- 8 Beneficiary eligibility determines who is
- 9 eligible, obviously, to receive benefits under
- 10 Medicaid. I have found, in -- at least in my
- 11 teaching, that people do not understand that Medicaid
- 12 is not a program for all poor people. I mean not
- 13 everybody who's poor can be a Medicaid beneficiary.
- 14 And so I --
- That's just learned from experience, it needs to
- 16 be explained.
- 17 Q. And that's all you meant by saying it has
- 18 special relevance to this case?
- 19 A. It has special relevance to explaining the
- 20 background of what Medicaid is, which is part of what
- 21 I was to do.
- 22 Q. Okay. But nothing in particular to this case as
- 23 opposed to any other case in which an understanding
- 24 of Medicare -- I mean, excuse me, Medicaid would be
- 25 important.

- 1 A. It's fair to say that the issue of who's
- 2 eligible is important in any Medicaid case.
- 3 Q. Right.
- 4 A. And to the extent that I -- I analyzed this, I
- 5 put in here who they are.
- 6 Q. No. I'm just trying to understand why you use
- 7 the term "special relevance --
- 8 A. Because --
- 9 Q. -- to this case."
- 10 A. -- it's -- it's of special relevance to any
- 11 case, I believe.
- 12 Q. Okay. On page nine of your report you point out
- 13 that "In 19" -- second full sentence of the page --
- 14 "In 1991, for example, Minnesota had the highest
- 15 annual Medicaid payment per recipient in the nation
- 16 for its disabled beneficiaries: \$14,788 per disabled
- 17 recipient compared to a national average of \$7,005;"
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. You're not suggesting that there's anything
- 21 wrong with them doing that; are you?
- 22 A. No. That's just saying -- no. That's a fact.
- 23 Q. That shouldn't diminish our damages in this case
- 24 in any way by itself.
- 25 A. That -- that's put in there as just an analysis

- 1 of here's what's happening.
- 2 Q. Right. But you're not suggesting that that is a
- 3 defect in Minnesota's handling of the Medicaid
- 4 program.
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. I'm just saying this is what is, --
- 8 Q. And --
- 9 A. -- or was in '91.
- 10 Q. What was your point in putting it in here then?
- 11 A. Giving --
- 12 I'm trying to show that there -- in Medicaid,
- 13 that this is still talking about Medicaid, within the
- 14 context of what -- context of what Medicaid is, and
- 15 that there are differences in state programs. This
- 16 was showing that in Minnesota, for example, here are
- 17 the people who are eligible and receiving high
- 18 dollars. It may be another state may be different.
- 19 Q. But you're not suggesting that because Minnesota
- 20 may pay more per disabled recipient, that that
- 21 necessarily means they have a more generous spirit
- 22 with respect to that; right?
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 24 question.
- 25 A. This was put in there as a snapshot of an

- 1 example of who the recipients are, beneficiaries are,
- 2 and the payment rates. That's what my analysis has
- 3 shown, that these are who are receiving the most
- 4 Medicaid dollars in the state of Minnesota.
- 5 Q. But you're not suggesting that because Minnesota
- 6 paid more per disabled recipient than the national
- 7 average by apparently a factor of two, that for some
- 8 reason that should lead to lesser damages for them in
- 9 this case. Simply trying --
- 10 A. My purpose --
- 11 MR. LINVILLE: Object to form.
- 12 A. -- in this doesn't have anything to do with
- 13 damages. It's just showing this is what is.
- 14 Q. Okay. And similarly the next sentence which
- 15 says, "Minnesota has significantly higher per
- 16 recipient Medicaid payments for its aged Medicaid
- 17 beneficiaries as compared to neighboring states and
- 18 the national average," that also is your opinion that
- 19 doesn't have anything to do with damages.
- 20 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 21 question.
- 22 A. This information is here to show you what's
- 23 happening in Medicaid or has happened in Medicaid in
- 24 Minnesota. I mean --
- 25 Q. All I want to know is does it have anything to

- 1 do with damages, in your opinion?
- 2 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 3 A. Damages was not an issue in my mind when I did
- 4 this. This is simply an analysis of what is.
- 5 Q. Well does it have anything to do with damages,
- 6 whether it was in your mind when you did it or not?
- 7 A. That's not -- that's not something for me to
- 8 determine. I mean it's not something that I've even
- 9 considered.
- 10 Q. That's not --
- 11 That's not your opinion though.
- 12 A. What?
- 13 Q. You don't have the opinion that it has something
- 14 to do with damages; correct?
- 15 A. No. My opinion was this is a snapshot of the
- 16 Medicaid system.
- 17 Q. And not that your opinion was or is that it has
- 18 something to do with damages. When you said with
- 19 respect to the disabled beneficiary payments that
- 20 your opinion -- that you weren't suggesting that had
- 21 anything to do with damages, and I simply want you to
- 22 acknowledge the same thing with respect to the next
- 23 sentence.
- 24 A. Okay. I'm just trying to make you understand
- 25 this was put in here to say here are who are getting

- 1 the dollars.
- 2 Q. Fine. You're not suggesting that Minnesota
- 3 ought to be limited to the national average with
- 4 respect to disabled recipients as opposed to the
- 5 payments it actually made; are you?
- 6 A. No, I am not saying that.
- 7 Q. And the next approximately page and a half in
- 8 which you recite a listing of changes in the Medicaid
- 9 program, that was simply to show that it is a program
- 10 that is not static and changes over time. You
- 11 weren't suggesting that Minnesota had somehow gone in
- 12 the wrong direction with respect to its Medicaid
- 13 program; were you?
- 14 A. No. It is there to show that it is a program
- 15 that changed over time, just as Medicaid programs do
- 16 in almost all states.
- 17 MR. McKENNA: Okay. While I look at my
- 18 notes, would you calculate how much time I have
- 19 left?
- 20 THE REPORTER: Thirty-four minutes.
- 21 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 22 Q. During your studies in preparation for giving
- 23 your opinion, were you able to conclude there was --
- 24 that there was any form of fraud and abuse that was
- 25 more prevalent in Minnesota than elsewhere?

- 1 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 2 A. I have not made such a conclusion. I'm still
- 3 reading, but I have -- I have not made that
- 4 conclusion, no.
- 5 Q. What are the issues with respect to which you
- 6 expect to supplement your existing report?
- 7 A. I'm not sure what all they would be right now.
- 8 Q. Well are you sure of some of them?
- 9 A. No. I reserve waiting until I have finished
- 10 reviewing everything more in depth before I make a
- 11 statement like that.
- 12 Q. Have you been saying to me that you haven't --
- 13 that there's some data you haven't looked at at all,
- 14 or are you saying that you're re-examining all the
- 15 information?
- 16 A. I'm saying I'm re-examining. I've looked at all
- 17 of it. I received data quite recently, for example,
- 18 even in the past week, that I need to go back and
- 19 look through.
- MR. McKENNA: Why don't we take a short
- 21 break. I think I'm nearing the end, but --
- 22 regardless of how much time I have, so if --
- MR. LINVILLE: Okay.
- MR. McKENNA: Five minutes or so.
- 25 (Recess taken.)

- 1 BY MR. McKENNA:
- 2 Q. Have you been a member of any advocacy group
- 3 with respect to the issue of smoking and health?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. How about any groups that concern themselves
- 6 with the welfare system in this country?
- 7 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 8 question.
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Is the additional work that you expect to do
- 11 prior to supplementation, is that going to be
- 12 involved in rereviewing the materials you already
- 13 have, or do you expect to be doing additional
- 14 research?
- 15 A. I'm going to continue to review the material I
- 16 already have. As I say, some of it has -- I've only
- 17 seen a couple of days ago, and if there -- if more
- 18 comes in, then I will also evaluate that.
- 19 Q. When you reviewed the plaintiffs' expert damages
- 20 report, did you draw any conclusions about its
- 21 accuracy or proprietary?
- 22 A. I didn't --
- 23 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 24 A. I didn't even attempt to.
- 25 Q. And would it be fair to say that the only aspect

- 1 of that damages issue that you feel qualified to
- 2 offer any opinion on is the extent to which fraud and
- 3 abuse may have inflated the damages of the
- 4 plaintiffs?
- 5 A. Yes, that's all I'm looking at.
- 6 Q. Do you have a recollection of who Robert Baird
- 7 was?
- 8 A. At this time of the day, I'm not sure who I -- I
- 9 don't -- I'm not sure if he was --
- 10 It seems to me that he was once McKeever's
- 11 supervisor, but I simply cannot -- I would have to go
- 12 back and look at that again.
- 13 Q. Who is Larry Woods?
- 14 A. Ah. Counsel, I'm simply not able to answer
- 15 these. Too confused. I think I confused Baird with
- 16 Woods.
- 17 Q. Wesley Book, who is he?
- 18 A. I don't remember other than the name.
- 19 Q. You recently received an affidavit from Reatha
- 20 Clark, who characterized herself as a partner of
- 21 Coopers & Lybrand LLP. Do you recall seeing that?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 Q. And her affidavit concerned a review of two
- 24 individual Minnesota Medicaid recipients. Do you
- 25 understand that?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Did you have a chance to review that document;
- 3 that is to say, her affidavit?
- 4 A. I have read it.
- 5 Q. Did it add anything to your understanding of the
- 6 issues in this case?
- 7 A. To the understanding of the general issues in
- 8 the case?
- 9 Q. No, the issues that you were asked to address,
- 10 the issues that are the subject matter of your
- 11 testimony.
- 12 A. Well I haven't seen -- that's preliminary. I
- 13 haven't seen --
- If there's a follow-up, it's relevant to the
- 15 issue of the accuracy of claims that are filed.
- 16 Q. My question is: Did this add anything to your
- 17 understanding of the issues in this case? Did this
- 18 tell you something about Medicaid fraud and abuse
- 19 that you didn't know before you read it?
- 20 A. About fraud and abuse generally, no.
- 21 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that what her affidavit
- 22 says is that they reviewed some substantial material
- 23 with respect to two individual Minnesota Medicaid
- 24 recipients and concluded that there was data with
- 25 respect to each of them that might be indicative of

- 1 inappropriate Medicaid payments?
- 2 A. Could I see the --
- 3 I don't have that in front of me.
- 4 Q. Yes.
- 5 A. At least I don't think I do.
- 6 Q. With counsel's consent, I'll just show you this
- 7 copy and not have one marked, because I'm not ready
- 8 to have one marked.
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: That's fine.
- 10 A. I think that's an accurate statement.
- 11 Q. And that wasn't news to you, that there might be
- 12 somebody who got inappropriate Medicaid payments from
- 13 the Minnesota system; was it?
- 14 A. Well I consistently said that I believe there
- 15 are people getting inappropriate payments from the
- 16 Minnesota Medicaid system.
- 17 Q. And so now Coopers & Lybrand have discovered two
- 18 of them. Basically that's it; right?
- 19 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 20 A. They've issued a report.
- 21 Q. And that report, does it add anything to your
- 22 understanding of the issues with respect to the
- 23 prevalence of fraud and abuse in the Minnesota
- 24 Medicaid system?
- 25 A. Well I'll reserve --

- 1 There may be more information coming, for one
- 2 thing, apparently.
- 3 Sorry.
- 4 (Witness reviews computer screen.)
- 5 A. Does it add anything to my knowledge of general
- 6 issues?
- 7 Q. No, of course not.
- 8 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form. Are you
- 9 saying no --
- MR. McKENNA: No, I mean she's --
- 11 You know what my question was.
- 12 Q. My question was: Does it add anything to your
- 13 knowledge of the issues with respect to the
- 14 prevalence of fraud and abuse in the Minnesota
- 15 Medicaid system? You know that's the question.
- 16 A. It shows me that on the claims they've reviewed
- 17 there were a lot of errors, or appear to be.
- 18 Q. Right. Okay. Anything else that it shows you?
- 19 A. It shows some types of errors.
- 20 Q. Okay. And those errors are of the type that you
- 21 thought might be the case with respect to your
- 22 analysis of this system with regard to some other
- 23 providers -- I mean some other recipients; right?
- 24 A. Those errors are the types of errors one --
- Yes, these are some of the types of errors one

- 1 would anticipate seeing.
- 2 Q. What I'm trying to get at, this isn't anything
- 3 new to you. It didn't add anything, didn't give you
- 4 any new insight. I mean you believed before that
- 5 there was a substantial amount of fraud and abuse in
- 6 the system, and now you've been shown that somebody
- 7 else has found at least two people who appear to have
- 8 had or may have had inappropriate payments; right?
- 9 MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form of the
- 10 question.
- 11 A. One, as I said, there may be more coming, so I
- 12 reserve seeing the whole -- if there's more, what the
- 13 whole report says, but it also serves to show that,
- 14 yes, specifically in Minnesota, there are some of
- 15 these claims that were erroneously paid.
- 16 Q. Anything else that it tells you?
- 17 A. Those are the general things that it tells me as
- 18 I sit and look at it now.
- 19 Q. Okay. Anything about that that caused you to
- 20 alter your opinions in any way in this case?
- 21 A. To alter my opinions?
- 22 Q. I mean after reading that, you still have the
- 23 same opinion as before, that there is a substantial
- 24 amount of fraud and abuse in the Minnesota Medicaid
- 25 system; true?

- 1 A. I still believe that, yes.
- 2 Q. Nothing else that it does to your opinion?
- 3 Just trying to understand whether or not this is
- 4 of great significance to you, that's all.
- 5 A. As I said, I just got this, and there --
- 6 apparently there's going to be more coming, and I
- 7 would like to see the entire report.
- 8 Q. And after you see the entire report, there may
- 9 be something additional that occurs to you about
- 10 that, but as you look at it now, there's nothing more
- 11 that occurs to you as to the significance of that; is
- 12 that right?
- MR. LINVILLE: Object to the form.
- 14 A. Well, as I say, obviously it's a report saying
- 15 that here are claims that show apparently specific
- 16 incidences of inappropriate payment.
- 17 Q. Okay. Nothing else?
- 18 MR. LINVILLE: I have no questions.
- 19 (Discussion off the record.)
- 20 A. At this moment, no, I don't.
- 21 MR. McKENNA: All right. Now I have no
- 22 further questions.
- MR. LINVILLE: I have no questions.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 25 (Deposition concluded at 5:15 o'clock p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, Richard G. Stirewalt, hereby certify
3	that I am qualified as a verbatim shorthand reporter
4	that I took in stenographic shorthand the testimony
5	of JUDITH W. OVERALL at the time and place aforesaid
6	and that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages
7	189 through 476 is a true and correct, full and
8	complete transcription of said shorthand notes, to
9	the best of my ability.
10	Dated at Minneapolis, Minnesota, this 21st
11	day of November, 1997.
12	
13	
14	
15	RICHARD G. STIREWALT
16	Registered Professional Reporter
17	Notary Public
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, JUDITH W. OVERALL, the deponent, hereby
3	certify that I have read the foregoing transcript
4	consisting of pages 189 through 476, and that said
5	transcript is a true and correct, full and complete
6	transcription of my deposition except:
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	JUDITH W. OVERALL
16	Deponent
17	
18	Sworn and subscribed to before me this day
19	of , 1997.
20	
21	
22	
23	Notary Public
24	
25	My commission expires .
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953